THE OBJECTIVE LENS

A Rebuttal to "70 Questions The Shi'ah Cannot Answer"

AGBOOLA OLAWALE ABDWASI

ABOUT THE BOOK

The Objective Lens is a comprehensive academic response to the lecture delivered by Professor Muhammad Mansour Ibrahim (Uthman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto, Nigeria). This lecture was translated from Hausa to English and subsequently transcribed into a book titled "70 Unanswered Questions – A Challenge to the Shi'ah." Professor Mansour posed 77 questions aimed at challenging the fundamental beliefs of the Shi'ah. Interestingly, some of these questions are academically grounded, while others are polemical and often directed at the Shi'ah.

In addition to providing answers to each of the 77 questions to dispel long-standing misinterpretations and, at times, deliberate misrepresentations of Shi'ah beliefs, this book serves as a golden key to unlocking further research fields in Islamic Studies. Written in a clear and scholarly style, it is designed for students of knowledge and open-minded readers. The book addresses various topics, including Wilayah, the Ahl al-Bayt, the Sahābah, the Noble Qur'an, and al-Taqiyyah, among many other sensitive subjects.

It is hoped that this research work will help ease the tensions surrounding the Sunni-Shi'ah dichotomy rather than intensify them.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Agboola Olawale Abdwasi (b. 1980) is a distinguished scholar whose academic journey bridges both the sciences and the humanities. A graduate of a renowned higher institution in Nigeria, he pursued further studies at the Islamic Seminary of Qom, one of the world's foremost centers of Islamic learning. Abdulwasi's diverse expertise encompasses Chemistry, Islamic Philosophy, Islamic Theology, Qur'anic Exegesis, Hadith Sciences, and Islamic History, reflecting his commitment to interdisciplinary scholarship. His grounding in these fields positions him as a unique voice at the intersection of faith and science.

Currently, Abdulwasi' is a PhD candidate at Al-Mustafa International University in Qom, Iran, where he continues to delve deeper into Islamic thought and contribute to academic discourse. His work is marked by a dedication to bridging traditional Islamic sciences with contemporary global perspectives.

ISBN 9798283624662

9798283624662

90000

THE OBJECTIV E LENS

A rebuttal to "70 questions the shi'ah cannot answer"

AGBOOLA OLAWALE ABDWASI

Copyright © 2025 Abdulwasi Olawale

ISBN: 9798283624662

All rights reserved.

For inquiries, comments, remarks, suggestions, corrections and criticisms, please

contact the author through:

seeabdwasi@gmail.com

In The Name of Allah, The Beneficent, The Merciful

ادْعُ إِلِى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحِكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُم بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَن ضَلَّ عَن سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ

Call them unto the way of thy Lord with Wisdom and goodly exhortation, and argue with them with that which is best. Verily thy Lord! He is the Best Knower of him who hath strayed from His way, and He is the Best Knower of the guided ones.

[Surah an-Nahl: 125]

DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to my father figure, my dearest Ustadh and mentor, ash-Sheikh Ibn Maryam, Abdullah Mustafa Oladimeji Ayinde Berende. May Allah prolong his life on the path of Iman, goodness and righteousness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Special thanks to Sheik Abdulwahab Omeiza Suberu who initiated this research work. My gratitude also goes to Sheikh (Dr.) Abubakar Salati, Sheikh Toliat Olawale Mustafa and brother Syed Ali for their constructive criticism and efforts to make this project a reality. I can never thank enough the efforts of my dearest brother al-Hafiz Zubair Olanrewaju Akande and al-Hafiz Muhammad Al-Baqir. My humble and profound gratitudes also goes to Shamsudeen Niyi Akinyooye, Omoleke Ibrahim Bolakale (a.k.a Vanguard), Hajj Muhammad Sherif Aroworowon, Ahmad Abdur-Rahman Kar'balai (a.k.a Bros B), and Hajj Ghali Olalekan Abu Hanifah. Lastly, my loving appreciation to my loving and dedicated wife, Hajia (Dr.) Baliqees Salih for her contributions and encouragements.

May Allah bless you all and all our respected brothers and sisters from Shi'i ithna Ashariyyah and Ahlu Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah.

CONTENTS

DEDICATION 5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 6
CONTENTS 7
IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION 16
PREFACE 17
INTRODUCTION 19
CHAPTER ONE 27
PERFECTION OF ISLAM 27
CHAPTER TWO 39
REASON FOR ALI'S SILENCE 39
CHAPTER THREE 54
WILL IMAM AL-MAHDI RULE 54
BY JEWISH LAW? 54
CHAPTER FOUR 63
SHI'ISM AND 63
PERSIAN LANGUAGE 63
CHAPTER FIVE 72
IMAMAH IN THE 72
QUR'AN AND HADITH (1) 72
CHAPTER SIX 93
IMAMAH IN THE 93
QUR'AN AND HADITH (2) 93

CHAPTER SEVEN 106
WHY WAS HAZRAT FATIMAH 106
NOT AMONGST THE IMAMS? 106
CHAPTER EIGHT 109
ISLAM OF THOSE WHO WERE 109
NOT AWARE OF ALI'S IMAMAH 109
CHAPTER NINE 114
ALI IN THE SIX-MAN 114
SHURAH COMMITTEE 114
CHAPTER TEN 119
WAS ABU BAKR APPOINTED 119
TO LEAD SALAT? 119
CHAPTER ELEVEN 130
ALI'S ROLE IN THE GOVERNMENTS 130
OF THE FIRST THREE CALIPHS 130
CHAPTER TWELVE 137
WHY DID ALI NOT 137
WRESTLE HIS RIGHT? 137
CHAPTER THIRTEEN 142
WHY DIDN'T HE FIGHT 142
HIS WAY TOTHE SEAT? 142
Question 13: 142
CHAPTER FOURTEEN 145
WHY DID ALI (INITIALLY) REJECT 145

THE KHILAFAH WHEN HE SAW 145
THE OPPORTUNITY? 145
Question 14: 145
CHAPTER FIFTEEN 153
AL-HASAN'S FAMILY 153
TREE AND LEADERSHIP 153
Question 15: 153
CHAPTER SIXTEEN 164
GHAYBAH OF 164
IMAM AL-MAHDI 164
Question 16: 164
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN 172
AL-MAHDI'S IMPORTANCE 172
TO THE UMMAH 172
Question 18: 172
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN 175
'ILM AL-GHAYB 175
(UNSEEN KNOWLEDGE) 175
OF THE IMAMS 175
Question 19: 175
CHAPTER NINETEEN 182
INFALLIBILITY OF THE IMAMS: 182
AL-HASAN VS AL-HUSEIN, ... 182

WHO WAS RIGHT IN THEIR DECISONS? 182

Question 20: 182

CHAPTER TWENTY 201

SWIMMING IN THE 201

POOL OF IGNORANCE 201

Question 21: 201

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE 206

SHI'A AND THE QUR'AN (1) 206

Question 23: 206

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO 217

SHI'A AND THE QUR'AN (2) 217

Question 24: 217

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE 229

SHI'A AND THE QUR'AN (3) 229

Question 25: 229

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR 238

WHAT IS MUS'HAF 238

OF FATIMAH? 238

Question 26: 238

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE 253

GOING IN CIRCLE 253

Question 27: 253

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX 254

OUT OF THE WINDOW 254

Question 28: 254
CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN 262
ALI'S REMARKS OF 262
THE SHEIKHAYN - WHO'S THE 262
BEST OF THE UMMAH 262
Question 29: 262
CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT 276
WHERE WAS THE PROPHET 276
BURIED? 276
Question 30: 276
CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE 293
ALI AND THE CIVIL WARS 293
Question 31: 293
CHAPTER THIRTY 299
WORLDLY RICHES 299
Question 32: 299
CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE 306
IMAGINARY QUESTIONS FROM 306
THE KHAWARIJ 306
Question 33: 306
CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO 318
PROPHET'S LAST WILL 318
(WASIYYAH) [1] 318
Question 34: 318

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE 332
PROPHET'S LAST WILL 332
(WASIYYAH) [2] 332
Question 35: 332
Question 36: 332
Question 37: 332
Question 38: 332
CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR 336
COMPARING BLACK AND 336
WHITE 336
Question 39: 336
CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE 345
ALI, UTHMAN AND THEIR 345
RELATIVE GOVERNORS 345
Question 40: 345
CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX 358
RELATIONSHIP WITH "APOSTATES" 358
Question 41: 358
Question 42: 360
Question 43: 362
CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN 366
DID THE SAHABAH 366
APOSTATIZED? 366
Question 44: 366

Question 45: 391
Question 46: 395
Question 47: 404
Question 48: 409
CHAPTER THIRTY-EIGHT 424
WIVES AND CHILDREN OF THE 424
PROPHET 424
Question 49: 424
Question 50: 424
CHAPTER THIRTY-NINE 438
THE NOBLE PROPHET'S 438
IN-LAWS 438
Question 51: 438
Question 52: 445
Question 53: 453
Question 54: 459
Question 55: 467
Question 56: 468
CHAPTER FOURTY 470
CALIPH ABU BAKR, HAZRAT 470
FATIMA AND FADAK 470
Question 57: 470
Question 58: 470
Question 59: 470

Question 60: 471
Question 61: 471
Question 62: 471
Question 63: 473
CHAPTER FOURTY-ONE 511
FEW QUR'ANIC VERSES 511
Question 64: 511
Question 65: 511
CHAPTER FOURTY-TWO 515
WHO KILLED IMAM 515
AL-HUSEIN? 515
Question 66: 515
Question 67: 523
Question 68: 523
Question 69: 524
Question 70: 524
CHAPTER FOURTY THREE 535
NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH 535
[TEMPORARY MARRIAGE] 535
Question 71: 535
Question 73: 561
CHAPTER FOURTY FOUR 564
TURBAH AL-HUSEINIYAH 564
Question 74: 564

Question 75: 573
CHAPTER FOURTY FIVE 585
AT-TAQIYYAH 585
Question 77: 585
CONCLUSION 617
COMMON TERMS 617
THE END 620
BIBLIOGRAPHY 620

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION

This book is a compendium of various topics in form of questions and answers making up 45 chapters. Some of the chapters are inter-related, or are extention of others but majority of them are independent. Wherever an insufficient answer is given, details are exposed in a related chapter. However, because of the bulkiness of this book, it is advised to select and read per topic(s) or chapter(s) at individual's choice and interest. The book is specifically designed for students of learning, truth-seekers and scholars to enhance their horizon in research work and discovering the truth.

PREFACE

A lecture titled "70 Unanswered Questions – A Challenge to the Shi'ites" was presented by Prof. Muhammad Mansur Ibrahim, a lecturer at the prestigious Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, Nigeria, in 2006. The lecture was in Hausa language but later transcripted and translated into English, and then published into a book by Ahlulbaiti & Sahaba Foundation, Nigeria. The lecturer asks the Shi'a a total of 70 questions (even though they are 77 in total), questions dubbed impossible for the Shi'a to answer. Interestingly, the lecturer promised and gave assurance of converting to Shi'ah if just 7 out of his "impossible to answer" questions are responded to.

Although we do not have a detailed report of the effect of this lecture in its primary environment but according to a certain Sheikh, late Ja'afar Mahmud Adam (may Allah be merciful on his soul), the lecture seemed to have been widely publicised. The late Sheikh was reported to have said in his last lecture, "I have never heard a convincing lecture in Hausa language that discussed Shiism as those tapes. It is nothing but an inspiration from Allah". Perhaps this was what inspired the lecturer to transcribe and translate the lecture into English in order to reach more audience.

We know for a fact that the lecture was responded to by leading Shi'a scholars in Sokoto state (Nigeria) when it was first aired. Each of the questions is reportedly responded to in the same Hausa local language but ever since then, things have not gone beyond that.

However, this present book re-examines these 77 questions and gives a befitting, convincing and jaw-breaking responses to not only 7 as challenged by the author/lecturer but the whole 77 questions. The very exaggeration and arrogant statement "Seventy questions that have no answers" used to described the lecture/book will in sha Allah be exposed and shattered into pieces in an academic and scholarly manner. Will the lecturer/author fulfil or relinquish his expensive joke and promise

afterward? That is between him and his conscience. The least we demand from him and people like him is decorum on Shi'ism and a stop to unacademic research and propaganda on the beliefs of Shi'a Muslims.

The writing style of this book is question and answer method. Each of the seventy questions will be presented and reply to it will follow suit. Wherever the question is too long or there is repetition, only the main point will be presented. This style is adopted to balance the equation so that whoever is not opportuned to listen to the Hausa lecture or read its English transcription will have the opportunity to cross examine the two sides of the dialogue. Also, it is duty bound on us to correct all the grammatical errors and mistakes while quoting the transcribed book to achieve the standard expected of us.

Lastly, we need to emphasise that this book with its contents is never meant to create discord or widen the gap of differences between Muslims' denominations rather its primary objective is to dispel myth and propaganda against Shi'ism. We sincerely hope this will close the door of misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Shia beliefs and doctrines.

INTRODUCTION

Shortly after the demise of the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny), ideological, jurisprudential and political interpretations created dichotomy between the early Muslims. The very first disagreement amongst the Muslims was at the death-bed of the holy Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) where he commanded his companions to bring pen and paper so that he could write for them a specific thing they should follow which will protect them from going astray after him. Alas! While some of the companions continued to repeat the command of the Prophet, others accused their Prophet of being delirious and not knowing what he was saying. A serious disagreement broke out between these two groups leading to their eviction altogether from the sight of the Prophet. Abdullah Ibn Abbas (may Allah be please with him) used to cry profusely whenever he recalled that day and tagged it "raziyat yaomul-Khamis – the great calamity of Thursday." [1]

---

[1]Imam ,Bukhari documents Narrated Sa`id bin Jubair: that he heard Ibn `Abbas saying, "Thursday! And you know not what Thursday is? After that Ibn `Abbas wept till the stones on the ground were soaked with his tears. On that I asked Ibn `Abbas, "What is (about) Thursday?" He said, "When the condition (i.e. health) of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) deteriorated, he said, Bring me a bone of scapula, so that I may write something for you after which you will never go astray. The people differed in their opinions although it was improper to differ in front of a prophet, They said, What is wrong with him? Do you think he is delirious? Ask him (to understand). The Prophet (peace be upon him) replied, Leave me as I am in a better state than what you are asking me to do. Then the Prophet (peace be upon him) ordered them to do three things saying, Turn out all the pagans from the Arabian Peninsula, show respect to all foreign delegates by giving them gifts as I used to do. " The sub-narrator added, "The third order was something beneficial which either Ibn `Abbas did not mention or he mentioned but I forgot.

Polemically, certain scholars tried to defend this event and some even downplayed the event in order to protect the personality of some prominent sahabah who involved themselves in the ugly scene.

A rightful thinking person will ask what the Prophet intended to write to the fact that he laid a great emphasis on it saying, "if you follow it, you will never go astray after me." To the Sunni, it wasn't something special and they argued that had it been it is truly special, Prophet would have written it irrespective of the opposition. And besides, the opposing sahabah were only concerned about the health of the Prophet; thereby, did not want to stress him. To the Shi'a, the noble Prophet intended to write and document the verbal message of his last hajj when he appointed Ali ibn Abi Taalib (peace be upon him) as the Mawla[2] of whomsoever he is his Mawla. Shia understood this to be successorship after the demise of the Prophet.

Shia further argued that had those opposing sahabah truly concerned about the health of their Prophet, why would they go so low accusing him of raving madness and shouting in front of him? Shia concluded that they have sensed the intention of the Prophet to document Ali as his successor which will be bind upon them hence, their opposition. Interestingly, the statement used by the Prophet in his last hajj was exactly the same statement he used while requesting for pen and paper on his death-bed: "I am leaving over you two weighty things (in other version, two khalifah was mentioned) that if you adhere to it, you will never go astray; Quran and my itrah, my Ahl al-Bayt..."[3]

Immediately after the demise of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny), there was a great tussle on the issue of Khilafah (succession) which created three (3) opposing camps. The second Caliph Umar ibn al-Khattab

---

[2] This is discussed fully in chapter 1.

[3] This is discussed fully in chapter 32 & 33.

beautifully summarised what went wrong in one of his very long speeches thus:

Ibn Abbas: I used to teach qira'at (Quran recitation) to some men... Abd al-Rahman came to me and said, "If only you had seen a man who came to Amir al-Muminin (Umar) today, saying: "O Amir al-Muminin! What do you say about so-and-so? He says, "When Umar dies, I will pledge allegiance to so-and-so, for, I swear by Allah, the pledge of allegiance given to Abu Bakr was nothing but a sudden/error and it succeeded."

عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ، قَالَ كُنْتُ أُقْرِئُ رِجَالاً مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ مِنْهُمْ عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ عَوْفٍ، فَبَيْنَمَا أَنَا فِي مَنْزِلِهِ بِمِنًى، وَهُوَ عِنْدَ عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ فِي آخِرِ حَجَّةٍ حَجَّهَا، إِذْ رَجَعَ إِلَيَّ عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ فَقَالَ لَوْ رَأَيْتَ رَجُلاً أَتَى أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ الْيَوْمَ فَقَالَ يَا أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ هَلْ لَكَ فِي فُلاَنٍ يَقُولُ لَوْ قَدْ مَاتَ عُمَرُ لَقَدْ بَايَعْتُ فُلاَنًا، فَوَاللَّهِ مَا كَانَتْ بَيْعَةُ أَبِي بَكْرٍ إِلاَّ فَلْتَةً، فَتَمَّتْ

So, Umar became angry. Then, he said, In sha Allah, I will stand before the people tonight and will warn them against these people who want to usurp their affairs.

فَغَضِبَ عُمَرُ ثُمَّ قَالَ إِنِّي إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَقَائِمٌ الْعَشِيَّةَ فِي النَّاسِ، فَمُحَذِّرُهُمْ هَؤُلاَءِ الَّذِينَ يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَغْصِبُوهُمْ أُمُورَهُمْ. قَالَ عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ فَقُلْتُ يَا أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ لاَ تَفْعَلْ فَإِنَّ الْمَوْسِمَ يَجْمَعُ رَعَاعَ النَّاسِ وَغَوْغَاءَهُمْ، فَإِنَّهُمْ هُمُ الَّذِينَ يَغْلِبُونَ عَلَى قُرْبِكَ حِينَ تَقُومُ فِي النَّاسِ

So, Umar sat on the pulpit...praised Allah as He deserved. Then he said: "I have been informed that a speaker amongst you says, When Umar dies, I will pledge allegiance to so-and-so. One should not deceive oneself by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abu Bakr was an error and it succeeded. **NO DOUBT, IT WAS SURELY LIKE THAT.** However, Allah saved from its EVIL...

ثُمَّ إِنَّهُ بَلَغَنِي أَنَّ قَائِلاً مِنْكُمْ يَقُولُ وَاللَّهِ لَوْ مَاتَ عُمَرُ بَايَعْتُ فُلاَنًا. فَلاَ يَغْتَرَّنَّ امْرُؤٌ أَنْ يَقُولَ إِنَّمَا كَانَتْ بَيْعَةُ أَبِي بَكْرٍ فَلْتَةً وَتَمَّتْ أَلاَ وَإِنَّهَا قَدْ كَانَتْ كَذَلِكَ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ وَقَى شَرَّهَا، وَإِنَّهُ قَدْ كَانَ مِنْ خَبَرِنَا حِينَ تَوَفَّى اللَّهُ نَبِيَّهُ صلى الله عليه وسلم إِلاَّ أَنَّ الأَنْصَارَ خَالَفُونَا وَاجْتَمَعُوا بِأَسْرِهِمْ فِي سَقِيفَةِ بَنِي سَاعِدَةَ، وَخَالَفَ عَنَّا عَلِيٌّ وَالزُّبَيْرُ وَمَنْ مَعَهُمَا، وَاجْتَمَعَ الْمُهَاجِرُونَ إِلَى أَبِي بَكْرٍ فَقُلْتُ لأَبِي بَكْرٍ يَا أَبَا بَكْرٍ انْطَلِقْ بِنَا إِلَى إِخْوَانِنَا هَؤُلاَءِ مِنَ الأَنْصَارِ.

Ansar opposed us and gathered, all of them, at Saqifah Bani Sa'idah; and Ali, al-Zubayr and whoever was with them both, also opposed and the Muhajiruns gathered towards Abu Bakr..." [4]

In fact, Imam al-Bukhari later documented that it took Ali ibn Abi Taalib six months[5] before he could pay allegiance to the first Caliph Abu Bakr, and even the allegiance was paid only when he discovered people's animosity towards him after the death of his beloved wife Faatimah, the daughter of the Prophet who also left the world without recognising the leadership of Abu Bakr and refused to talk with him till she passed. Few athar claimed she got angry at Abu Bakr when the later refused to grant her wish by not

---

[4] Sahih al-Bukhari 6830 In-book reference: Book 86, Hadith 57USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 8, Book 82, Hadith 817 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/86/57

[5] Sahih Bukhari 4240, In-book reference: Book 64, Hadith 278, USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 546 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/64/278

Sahih Muslim 1759 c; In-book reference: Book 32, Hadith 63, USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 19, Hadith 4354 https://sunnah.com/muslim/32/63

giving her a piece of land that belonged to her father. The Caliph was reported to have said, "I heard the Prophet who said no one inherit we the Prophet. Whatever we leave goes into charity".

Could this be what truly angered Bibi Faatimah, the Doyen of all the believing women that she refused to talk to the Caliph till her death? Why would a piece of land angered Faatimah (peace be upon her) to such extent of not giving allegiance to the Caliph of her time; yet, the Prophet said in a popular hadith, *"whoever dies without paying allegiance to the Imam of his time dies the death of the age of ignorance"*[6] ?! What is reasonable even without going deep into history is that Faatimah never recognised Abu Bakr as the rightful successor of the Prophet otherwise, we will have to settle with the second option that she died a Kaafir (unbeliever) going by the abovementioned hadith. This is the bitter truth some hadith collectors and certain historians cannot live with; hence, the need to paint the whole scene as "land related issue" in their report not minding the consequences.

Theologically, this genesis was what brought about the first dichotomy of the Muslims into Shi'a with the ideology that Ali ibn Abi Taalib was the rightful successor of the Prophet, and Sunni who believed Abu Bakr ibn Abi Quhafa was the rightful successor.

If this was the genesis then how and why Shi'a and Shi'ism is being treated by the Sunni as imposter to the fact that for years there had been great propaganda and Shi'a-phobia across the Muslim world? Some even go so low in labelling the Shi'ism as "new religion" alien to Islam. Others displayed their compound ignorance by claiming Shi'ism was founded by a legendary figure named Abdullah ibn Saba, someone with no single Sunni authentic athar (report, narration) regarding the accolades attributed to

---

[6] Sahih Muslim 1851 a; In-book reference: Book 33, Hadith 90, USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 20, Hadith 4562 https://sunnah.com/muslim/33/90

him. All praise be to Allah that old foolish tales like Shi'a believe arch-angel Jubril made a mistake in giving Muhammad Mustafa (peace be upon him and his progeny) the prophethood whilst he supposed to give Ali, Shi'a has their own Qur'an different from general Quran at the hands of the Muslim etc have been buried with the passage of time when people now have access to information.

Furthermore, if the Sunni can split into various groups in their aqeedah (ideology) having Mu'tazilah, Matrudiyyah, Ash'ariyah, Athariyah etc on one hand, and in their fiqh (jurisprudence) having Malikiyyah, Shafi'yah, Hanbaliyah, Hanafiyah (not mentioning the dead school of thoughts), and each of them having huge ideological and jurisprudencial differences; then, why are Shi'a being treated as alien to Islam to the fact that people are even discouraged to read their books or even relate with them?

On March 2019, the cleric and former Imam of the grand Mosque, Adel al-Kalbani in an interview with Saudi broadcaster MBC backtracked on his view which considered Shia Muslim scholars as Kuffar (unbelievers)[7] . He said: "I no longer declare apostasy on those who believe in One God, eat our (halal) meat and prostrate toward our Qibla (direction of mecca)"

Sheik Adel al-Kalbani said he changed his mind after reading a book given to him by a professor of Sharia at Ummi al-Qurra University, which discussed the issue of heresy. Sheikh al-Kalbani reportedly intended to publish an article to formally announce his view about the Shia Muslim but bowed to Saudi government pressure who opposed the idea.

One can imagine the damage, propaganda and ignorance this Sheikh has spread across the Muslim world about Shi'a. If it could take a Sheikh years to mend his ideology and view on Shi'a, perhaps it will take an entire lifetime before an ordinary Muslim (who constitute the largest

---

[7] https://www.alaraby.co.uk/english/amp/news/2019/3/25/ex-imam-of-mecca-no-longer-considers-shia-heretics

population of the 1.6 billion Muslim world) could get his senses aright that Shi'a are not alien or imposter as it is being propagated. I remembered my conversation with a Sunni scholar who quoted one of the polemic saying of Sheikh Ibn Taymiyyah that Shia are liars, worse than the Jews.

I said if that is the case, then first, you will have to proclaim certain Sahabah (companions of the Prophet) who were known as "Shi'a of Ali" as liars and worse than Jew; and second, you will have to discard over X% of your ahadith (prophetic narrations) in sahih Bukhari, sahih Muslim, the other four popular books of hadith and many other unpopular books of ahadith. He said, "why, what do you mean?" I said because these X% ahadith were either narrated directly or indirectly by the Shia if you examine the chain of the transmitters. He was dumbfounded and very careful of his next word.

The quicker we do away with propaganda, lying and sheer ignorance in dealing with ourselves, the sooner we will understand our differences and learn how to cohabit with each other peacefully.

We pray to Allah to grant us proper understanding and purify our nafs (soul) from harbouring hatred, arrogance, evil and unrepentant ignorance – factors that serve as obstacles against truth.

Abdulwasi Olawale A.

23rd Rajab 1446

[23rd Jan., 2025]

SHI'ISM AND ISLAM

CHAPTER ONE

PERFECTION OF ISLAM

Question 1:

This question is based on the saying of Allah (Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala) in Surah Al-Ma'idah, verse 3, where He says: "... this day, I have perfected your religion for you, completed My favor upon you, and chosen Islam as your religion..."

The above verse was revealed in the 10th year after migration (Hijra), ninety-seven (97) days before the demise of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam. This is a clear indication that the Noble Prophet spent twenty-three years preaching the religion of Islam. However, it is also ten years after the establishment of the Islamic state.

The religion of Shi'ism, along with its doctrines and politics, emerged after the demise of the Noble Prophet.

The question here is: Is Shi'ism part of the religion that was perfected on the Day of Arafah or not? If it is part of that religion, then why didn't the Noble Prophet mention it? Why didn't he establish his religion on it? Why didn't he teach his students about it? And if it was after the religion had been perfected that Shi'ism emerged, then what is its need?

THE REPLY

Had Professor Muhammad Mansur Ibrahim knew the sabab an-Nuzul of the noble verse he quoted, he would have refrained from posing such question. On one hand, he assumed his own version of Islamic interpretation is the very Islam that was perfected in the noble verse. On the other hand, he treated Shi'ism as a "new religion" that is alien to Islam hence, in his view Shi'ism with its ideologies, doctrines and politics could not have been part of the "perfected Islam".

First, we need to call the attention of the Professor and our Muslim brethren that there are two documented narrations as per the place "this day have I perfected your religion for you..." was revealed. One narration claimed it was revealed on the day of Arafah while the second narration says it was revealed at Ghadir Khumm (a watering area between Mecca and Madina).

It is very possible that the verse was revealed (twice) and read in those two places since both narrations are apparently authentic according to Sunni view.

Second, there are two noble verses connected to what happened at Ghadir khumm (as against the day of Arafah). These two verses put things in there right places. It is imperative to bring these two noble verses as they will give our reply a solid foundation.

First verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِن رَّبِّكَ وَإِن لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ وَاللَّهُ يَعْصِمُكَ مِنَ النَّاسِ.

O Apostle! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord; and if you do it not, then you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people ..." (sura al-maidah:67)

Point One: Did Shi'a cherry-pick?

With respect to sura al-Maidah: 67, using Tafsir of Imam Fakhr din ar-Razi, some Sunni scholars accused Shia of cherry picking "one view" out of ten views stated by Imam Fakhr din ar-Razi regarding the reason (sabab) for the verse's revelation (nuzul).

Truly, Imam Fakhr din ar-Razi in his Tafsir al-Kabir stated ten (10) possible reasons for the revelation of this verse. So, why did Shia "cherry picked" the one in favor of their claim?

The fact is that ONLY what Shia "cherry-pick" has solid and recurrent chain of evidence. In fact, more than five (5)

sahabah reported the verse was revealed about Ali ibn Abi Taalib at Ghadir khumm. That is more than enough to prove the tawattur (recurrence) of the report making it a mutawattir report. None of other 9 views even attempt to come closer. Imam Fakhr din Razi documents from two sahabah: Abdullah ibn Abbas and Bara'a ibn Asib[8].1 However, we quote Imam Thalabi who gave the chain to those reports.

Imam Thalabi (d. 427 H):

قال أبو جعفر محمد بن علي: معناه: بلغ ما أنزل إليك في فضل علي بن أبي طالب، فلما نزلت الآية أخذ

(عليه السلام) بيد علي فقال: ((من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه))

Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali said: Its meaning: [deliver what has been revealed to you] from virtues of Ali Ibn Abi Taalib, then when the verse was revealed, he (the Prophet) take Ali by hand and said: [whoever I am his mawla, then Ali is his mawla]

عن عدي بن ثابت، عن البراء قال: لما أقبلنا مع رسول الله في حجة الوداع كنا بغدير خم فنادى أن الصلاة

جامعة، و كسح تحت شجرتين، وأخذ بيد علي فقال: ((ألست أولى بالمؤمنين من أنفسهم)) قالوا: بلى يا رسول

الله. قال: ((هذا مولى من أنا مولاه. اللّٰهُمَّ وال من والاه، وعاد من عاداه))

[8] Fakhr Deen al-Razi, *Tafsir al-Kabir* (Dar al-Fikr, Beirut 1401), section 12 page 53; https://waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=1372

قال: فلقيه عمر فقال: هنيئا لك يا بن أبي طالب أصبحت وأمسيت مولى كل مؤمن ومؤمنة.

From Adi ibn Thaabit, from Bara'a (ibn Asib) who said: When we came with the Messenger of Allah in the farewell pilgrimage, at Ghadir khumm we prayed the congregational prayer, and halted under the tree, and he (the Prophet) took Ali by hand and said: "Do I have AWLA over the believers than themselves?" They all said, "Yes Oh Messenger of Allah. He (the Prophet then) said: "This (Ali ibn Abi Taalib) is MAWLA of whomever I am his mawla. O Allah, support him whoever support him, forsake him whoever forsake him"

Umar said: congratulations to you, O son of Abu Talib today you have become the MAWLA of every believing men and believing women.

عن الكلبي، عن أبي صالح، عن ابن عباس في قوله: { يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِن رَّبِّكَ}

قال: نزلت في علي (رضي الله عنه) فامر النبي أن يبلغ فيه، فأخذ (عليه السلام) بيد علي وقال:

(من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه، اللّهُمَّ وال من والاه، وعاد من عاداه).

From al-Kalbi, from Abi Saalih, from Ibn Abbas about His saying [O Apostle! deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord].

He said: It was revealed over Ali and Prophet was ordered to inform. He (Prophet) took Ali by hand and said: Whoever I am his mawla then Ali is his mawla..." [9]

---

[9] Al-Kashf wa al-Bayan fii tafsir al-Qur'an [Dar al-kutub al-ilmiyyah, Beirut 1425 H], sura al-Maidah: 67; vol. 6, section 2, pages 478 – 479, https://waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=10781

Here, we have 3 narrators: Abu Jafar i.e Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Husein ibn Ali ibn Abi Taalib; Bara'a ibn Asib and Abdullah ibn Abbas. However, Imam Suyuti gives two new entries in his tafsir.

Imam Suyuti (d. 911 H):

قوله تعالى: (يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِن رَّبِّكَ)

His saying: (O Apostle! deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord)

أخرج ابن أبي حاتم، وابن مردويه، وابن عساكر، عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال: نزلت هذه الآية (يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِن رَّبِّكَ) على رسول الله يوم غدير خم في علي بن أبي طالب.

Reported Abi Hatim, and ibn Mardawi, and ibn Asaakir, from Abi Saeed al-Khudri who said: This verse was revealed (O Apostle! deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord) upon the Messenger of Allah on the day of Ghadir khumm over Ali ibn Abi Taalib.

أخرج ابن مردويه، عن ابن مسعود قال : كنا نقرأ على عهد رسول الله (صلى الله عليه السلام) يا أيها الرسول بلغ ما أنزل إليك من ربك أن عليا مولى المؤمنين وان لم تفعل فما بلغت رسالة والله يعصمك من الناس

Reported ibn Mardawi, From Ibn Mas'ud who said: We used to read during the lifetime of messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) O Apostle! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord that Ali is MAWLA of all the believers and if you do not, then you have not delivered

His message, and Allah will protect you from the people. [10]

For brevity, we stop at these 5 reports: from (Ali ibn Abi Taalib via his grandson) Abu Jafar, Bara'a ibn Asib, Ibn Abbas, Ibn Mas'ud and Abu Saeed al-Khudri. This is a mutawattir report and in it (a mutawattir report), chain scrutiny is of no use. Besides, all the chains are even authentic.

Second Verse:

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir documents in his Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem:

[و] قال ابن جرير : وقد قيل : ليس ذلك بيوم معلوم عند الناس ، ثم روي من طريق العوفي عن ابن عباس في قوله : (اليوم أكملت لكم دينكم) يقول : ليس ذلك بيوم معلوم عند الناس قال : وقد قيل : إنها نزلت على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في مسيره إلى حجة الوداع . ثم رواه من طريق أبي جعفر الرازي ، عن الربيع بن أنس

قلت : وقد روى ابن مردويه من طريق أبي هارون العبدي ، عن أبي سعيد الخدري ; أنها أنزلت على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يوم غدير خم حين قال لعلي : من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه . ثم رواه عن أبي هريرة وفيه : أنه اليوم الثامن عشر من ذي الحجة ، يعني مرجعه عليه السلام من حجة الوداع

---

[10] Jalaludeen Suyuti, *ad-Dar al-Manthur fii al-Tafsir al-Ma'thur* (Dar al-Fikr,Beirut 1432), section 3; of. 117, https://waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=12384

Ibn Jarir said: It has been said: This is not a day not known to people, then it is narrated from Awfi through Ibn Abbas who says: (This day I have perfected your religion for you): He says: This is not a day not known to people. It has been said: it (the verse) is revealed to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, in the journey to the farewell hajj. Then it is (also) narrated through Abi Ja'far ar-Razi, from Rabi'i ibn Anas.

I said: It has been narrated from ibn Mardawi through Abi Haroun al-Hidi, from Abi Sa'id al-khudri (R): It (the verse) is revealed to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, on the day of Ghadir when he (the Messenger of Allah) said to Ali (Ibn Abi Talib): "Of whosoever I am his Mawla, then Ali is his Mawla."

Then, narration from Abi Hurairah and from him: It is the 18th day of Dhul Hijjah. That is, his (peace be upon him) returning from farewell Hajj."[11]

In short, there are two different verses in the same sura al-Maida that was revealed in connection with the saying of the Prophet.

Summary:

- Verse 67 of sura al-Maidah[12] ordered the Messenger of Allah to declare Ali ibn Abi Taalib as Mawla of the believers.
- Verse 3 of sura al-Maidah; Allah perfected the religion of Islam upon the Messenger of Allah's

---

[11] Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem, [Beirut Edition, Dar al-Marifat, 1412H) (sura al-maida: 3), vol. 2, p. 15

[12] **IMPORTANT NOTE:** These two noble verses *were revealed independently* in connection to the event of Ghadir khumm. However, due to arrangement of the Qur'an, they are found within other subject matter. This is what created confusion to some *mufassirun* (like Imam Fakhr din ar-Razi) who thought and concluded the verse (67 of sura Maida) was addressing the Jews. These are weighty mutawattir evidences that blow aside other views or thoughts.

declaration of Ali ibn Abi Taalib as Mawla of the believers.

Meaning of Mawla

Scholars of the Ahlu-Sunnah (except for a few) hide under the pretext that the word "mawla" has various meaning; hence, they interpreted the word [mawla] in the Prophet's declaration "of whosoever I am his mawla, Ali is his mawla" to mean "friend and helper."

Their excuse was an incident that happened a year before the event of Ghadir khumm where certain sahabah harboured the hatred of, and complained about Ali ibn Abi Taalib to the Prophet. Prophet had previously sent those sahabah to Yemen under the leadership of Ali ibn Abi Taalib.

These scholars are of the option that Prophet's declaration in Ghadir Khumm was to those sahabah where he had to declare Ali as their friend and not their enemy.

First, there is absolutely no evidence that the addressee in Ghadir khumm were those sahabah exclusively. On the contrary, the Prophet's declaration is general encompassing all believers (sahabah and non-sahabah) till eternity.

Second, Prophet had warned those sahabah immediately they made complaint to him[13] and their leader, Buraydah

---

[13] Prophet was reported to have said to them angrily:

فَقَالَ : مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ إِنَّ عَلِيًّا مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْهُ وَهُوَ وَلِيُّ كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ بَعْدِي

"What do you want from 'Ali?! What do you want from 'Ali?! Indeed 'Ali is from me, and I am from him, and **he is the wali of every believer after me**"

(may Allah be please with him) in particular never to hate Ali as Ali's hatred is tantamount to hypocrisy. Therefore, the declaration of Ali's Mawla-ship at Ghadir khumm was upon all believers.

So, what is the correct meaning of Mawla as used by the Prophet in his statement? The actual meaning of any word with differing meaning can be clearly established within the context it is used and not in an isolation.

Imam Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani among others documents the very context in which the Prophet's declaration [Of whosoever I am his Mawla, then Ali is his Mawla] was used.

Imam Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī copies this elaborate riwāyah of Isḥāq b. Rāhwayh:

وَقَالَ إِسْحَاقُ : أنا أَبُو عَامِرٍ الْعَقَدِيُّ ، عَنْ كَثِيرِ بْنِ زَيْدٍ ، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عُمَرَ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ ، عَنْ عَلِيٍّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ ، قَالَ : إِنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَضَرَ الشَّجَرَةَ بِخُمٍّ ، ثُمَّ خَرَجَ آخِذًا بِيَدِ عَلِيٍّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ : أَلَسْتُمْ تَشْهَدُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى رَبُّكُمْ ؟ قَالُوا : بَلَى ، قَالَ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وسَلَّمَ : أَلَسْتُمْ تَشْهَدُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ أَوْلَى بِكُمْ مِنْ أَنْفُسِكُمْ ، وَأَنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ أَوْلِيَاؤُكُمْ ؟ فَقَالُوا : بَلَى . قَالَ : فَمَنْ كَانَ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ مَوْلَاهُ ، فَإِنَّ هَذَا مَوْلَاهُ ، وَقَدْ تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ أَخَذْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا : كِتَابُ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى ، سَبَبُهُ بِيَدِهِ ، وَسَبَبُهُ بِأَيْدِيكُمْ ، وَأَهْلُ بَيْتِي ، هَذَا إِسْنَادٌ صَحِيحٌ ، وَحَدِيثُ غَدِيرِ خُمٍّ قَدْ أَخْرَجَهُ النَّسَائِيُّ مِنْ رِوَايَةِ أَبِي الطُّفَيْلِ ، عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ أَرْقَمَ ، وَعَلِيٍّ ،

Sahih Sunan Tirmidhi, Book on virtues, English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3712; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4077 https://sunnah.com/urn/635910

وَجَمَاعَةٍ مِنَ الصَّحَابَةِ ، وَفِي هَذَا زِيَادَةٌ لَيْسَتْ هُنَاكَ ، وَأَصْلُ الْحَدِيثِ أَخْرَجَهُ التِّرْمِذِيُّ أَيْضًا

Isḥāq said: Abū 'Āmir al-'Aqadī – Kathīr b. Zayd – Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'Alī – his father - 'Alī:

Verily, the Prophet, peace be upon him, came to a tree at (Ghadīr) Khumm. Then he came out, holding the hand of 'Alī, and saying: "Do you not testify that Allāh is your Lord?" They said, "Yes, we do." He said, "Do you not testify that Allāh and His Messenger are more entitled to you than yourselves and that Allāh and His Messenger are your Awliyā?" They said, "Yes, we do". He said, "So, whosoever Allāh and His Messenger are his Mawlā, verily this one (i.e. 'Alī) is his mawlā. I have left behind over you that which if you hold fast to it you will never go astray: the Book of Allāh – one end of which is in His Hand and the other in your hands – and my Ahl al-Bayt. [14]

Then, al-Ḥāfiẓ comments: This chain is ṣaḥīḥ.

In this hadith, the Messenger of Allah, salallahu alayhi wa ahli, was reported to have said "Do you not testify that Allah and His Messenger are more entitled (awla) to you than yourselves (anfusikum)...?" Only when the Sahabah replied in the affirmative that the Prophet now said, "For whomever I am his Mawla then 'Ali is his Mawla."

Mawla in this context means someone with higher authority over the believer – It is derived from the

[14] Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Maṭ ālib al-Āliyah bi Zawāid al-Masānīd al-Thamāniyyah* (Beirut: Dār al- Ma'rifah; 1414 H) [annotator: Prof. Shaykh Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī], vol., 4, p. 65, # 3972
https://library.islamweb.net/hadith/display_hbook.php?bk_no=325&pid=154669&hid=4075

Authority of Allah and His Messenger. For example, Allah says in His glorious book:

Surah Al-Ahzab, Verse 6:

... النَّبِيُّ أَوْلَى بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ أَنفُسِهِمْ

"The Prophet has a greater claim (AWLA) on the faithful than they have on themselves..."

In this noble ayah, Awla is used, a derivative of Mawla. Again, on this ayah, al-Hafiz ibn Kathir writes:

"Allah tells us how His Messenger is merciful and sincere towards his Ummah, and how he is closer to them than they are to themselves. His judgement or ruling takes precedence over their own choices for themselves, as Allah says:

فَلاَ وَرَبِّكَ لاَ يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لاَ يَجِدُواْ فِي أَنفُسِهِمْ حَرَجاً مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُواْ تَسْلِيماً

(But no, by your Lord, they can have no faith, until they make you judge in all disputes between them, and find in themselves no resistance against your decisions, and accept with full submission.) (4:65)..." [15]

Conclusion

With the above establishment, we gathered that perfection of Islam rests squarely on accepting Ali ibn Abi Taalib (peace be upon him) as the highest authority over the believers after Allah and His messenger. This is the very aqeedah (ideology) that the "Shi'a religion" is based upon. Therefore, Shi'ism is that perfected Islam meant in the verse, and declared by the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny).

---

[15] Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem*, under the chapter 33 of sura al-Ahzab: 6 http://library.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?idfrom=1474&idto=1474&bk_no=49&ID=1509#docu

CHAPTER TWO

REASON FOR ALI'S SILENCE

Question 2:

It is a known fact that when Sayyidina Uthman was martyred, all the Muslims paid homage to Ali ibn Abi Talib, Radiyallahu Anhu. The mantle of authority and leadership was given to him unanimously. It was after he decided to change one of the governors in power, who had massive support from his citizens, that the disagreement arose. Furthermore, the blood compensation for one of the governor's households that was murdered—namely, Sayyidina Uthman—was the point that triggered the conflict between them. This was the motive that the terrorists used to ignite their anger and cause war.

The question here is: When Sayyidina Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, was in a position of authority, why didn't he proclaim Shi'ism? Why didn't he produce a new Qur'an? Why didn't he decree temporary marriage (mut'ah) and perform it? Why didn't he give the acclaimed farm of Fatima, Radiyallahu Anha, that you always claim (Fadaq) and hand it over to her heirs? Why didn't he abrogate "As-Salatu Khairun Minan Naumi," which you said is an innovation of the companions? Why didn't he also add "Ashhadu Anna Aliyyan Waliyullah" in the Adhan proclamation, since doing so is part of your religious doctrines? Why didn't he deviate from any of the practices that the three Khalifahs (successors) followed? Is this not a clear indication that Ali is a Sunni and not a Shi'ite? Does this not show his complete loyalty and affection toward those successors who preceded him, contrary to your insinuations?

THE REPLY

The detail of the factors that led to the murder of the third Caliph Uthman ibn Affan, and the rebellion of Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan against Imam Ali ibn Abi Taalib is out of the scope of this book.9 However, in a nutshell, so long the

Sunni regard Ali ibn Abi Taalib as one of their recognized "khulafah al-Mahdiyyin ar-Rashidin – rightly guided Caliphs", then those who oppose him during his reign whether by mistake or deliberate were obviously on the wrong side. No amount of excuse can turn their wrong and rebellion to right. Now, to the questions:

First Question:

Why did Ali not preach Shi'ism on his assumption to power?

We have briefly established what Shi'ism is, and that this was preached by no other than the Prophet himself. Shi'ism is to believe in the authority of Ali ibn Abi Taalib over all the believers after having believed in Allah and His Prophet's authority. [See Ch. 5 for full details] Shi'ism is to follow the declaration of the Prophet when he said:

"Do you not testify that Allāh is your Lord?" They said, "Yes, we do." He said, "Do you not testify that Allāh and His Messenger are more entitled to you than yourselves and that Allāh and His Messenger are your Awliyā?" They said, "Yes, we do". He said, "So, whosoever Allāh and His Messenger are his Mawlā, verily this one (i.e. 'Alī) is his mawlā. I have left behind over you that which if you hold fast to it you will never go astray: the Book of Allāh – one end of which is in His Hand and the other in your hands – and my Ahl al-Bayt. "[16]

Shaykh Nasir al-Din al-Albani (d. 1999) admits:

يكفى عندنا القرآن و السنة و هم عندهم القرآن و أهل البيت

---

[16] Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Maṭ ālib al-Āliyah bi Zawāid al-Masānīd al-Thamāniyyah* (Beirut: Dār al- Ma'rifah; 1414 H) [annotator: Prof. Shaykh Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī], vol., 4, p. 65, # 3972

"It is sufficient that we (Ahlu-Sunnah) have the Qur'an and Sunnah, while they (the Shi'ah Imamiyyah) have the Qur'an and the Ahl al-Bayt." [17]

Also, Imam Ibn al-Qayyim also states:

إن فقهاء الإمامية من أولهم إلى آخرهم ينقلون عن أهل البيت

"Verily, the jurists of the Imamiyyah, from the first of them to the last, narrate from the Ahl al-Bayt" [18]

So, it was the Prophet himself that declared "tashayyu – Shi'ism" and it is for Ali ibn Abi Taalib to lead by example in guiding people to the right path. Therefore, such question [why did Ali not preach Shi'ism on his assumption to power] is invalid.

Second Question:

Why didn't Ali produce a new Qur'an?

This is one of many propagandas against the Shia. Interestingly, none of those who believe and continuously spread this propaganda has been able to produce a copy of this Shi'a "new Qur'an". How can you accuse your opponent without proof to support your point? "Produce your evidence if you are truthful" [al-Baqara: 111].

Some Sunni scholars and their followers are so economical with the truth that they point to few Shi'a hadiths (narrations) that apparently indicate the incompleteness of the holy Qur'an to justify their feeble talk that the Shi'a do not believe in the Quran used by the Muslim world. Apart from the fact that such ahadith are either regarded as

---

[17] Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, al-Fatawa al-Muhimmah (Dar al-Ghadi al-Jadid), 154

[18] Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, al-Sawa'iq al-Mursalah 'ala al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mu'atillah (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Dar al-'Asimah; 3rd edition, 1418 H) [annotator: Dr. Ali b. Muhammad al-Dakhil Allah], vol. 2, pp. 616 – 617

fabrication (mawdoo) by the Shi'a hadith experts or are misunderstood by Shi'a antagonists, the ahadith of the Ahlu-Sunnah graded as authentic by their scholars that directly or indirectly point to the incompleteness of the holy Quran are too numerous to count. From brevity, Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī (d. 361 H) documents:

عن ابن عباس في هذه الآية (لا تدخلوا بيوتا غير بيوتكم حتى تستأنسوا وتسلموا على أهلها) وقال : إنما هي خطأ من الكاتب حتى تستأذنوا وتسلموا

Ibn Abī Maryam–al-Firyābī –Sufyān – Shu'bah–Ja'far b.Iyā–Mujāhid:

Ibn 'Abbās said concerning His Statement, the Almighty, the Most Glorious {You who have īmān! do not enter houses other than your own until you have asked permission [tasta-nisū] and greeted their inhabitants} [24:27]: "The scribes made a mistake. It is only {until you have asked permission [tasta-dhinū]}." [19]

Shaykh al-Arnaūṭ says about the report: Its chain is ṣaḥīḥ upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.

Here, Ibn 'Abbās said that Qur'ān 24:27 contains a mistake, an error. He even gave the "correct" version of that āyah, and it is different from what we have today in the Qur'ān.

---

[19] Abu Ja'far al-Tahawi, *Sharḥ Mushkil al-Athār* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risālah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaūṭ], vol. 4, p. 249; Also, Imam Jarir Tabari in his book of Tafsir under this verse (sura Nur: 27) also quoted this report of Ibn Abbas. This can be verify online: https://www.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?idfrom=3532&idto=3532&bk_no=50&ID=3557

Shi'a do not believe in any other Quran than what the entire Muslim world use.[20] Our differences lie in the understanding and interpretation of the Quran.

How do Ahlu-Sunnah treat this hadith of Ibn Abbas? They believe it to be authentic, and there are more of the same genre in the Sunni's Hadith corpus. Had Shi'a scholars wanted to play the same dirty game as their Ahlu-Sunnah counterparts, they would have suffocated the Sunnis with these "authentic" hadith, discard their comments on it and then conclude that Ahlu-Sunnah, starting from the celebrated Sahabah, do not believe in the present Qur'an as error-free. Only sick-hearted people spread bogus news, and no one but ignorant accept it without sincere evaluation.

[20] For detail on Shia position on the Quran, you can read, "al-Bayan fi tafsir al-Quran – The prolegomena to the Quran" by Sayyid Abu al-Qasim al-Musawi al-Khu'i. It is available online: https://www.al-islam.org/al-bayan-fi-tafsir-al-quran- prolegomena-quran-sayyid-abu-al-qasimal-khoei

Third Question:

Why didn't Ali decree temporary marriage (mut'ah) and perform it?

The fact is Ali ibn Abi Taalib never declare Mut'ah as prohibited. In fact, before he assumed the authority, he used to sympathise with people saying, "If 'Umar had not forbidden mut'ah, none would have committed zinā except a wretched person."[21]

However, it might be said that Ali ibn Abi Taalib cautioned Ibn Abbas from giving people permission to perform Mut'ah perhaps during his reign as Caliph, that Prophet has prohibited Mu'tah and the eating of donkey's meat at Khaybar.[22] This narration attributed to Ali ibn Abi Taalib is either fabricated or has been tampered with. The reasons are as follow:

- There are other four (4) narrations from Abdullah ibn Umar[23] , Jabir ibn Abdullah al-Ansari[24] , Zahir

---

[21] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. Yazīd b. Kathīr b. Ghālib al-Āmulī al-Ṭabarī, Jāmi al-Bayān fī Tāwīl al-Qur'ān (Dār al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Ṣidqī Jamīl al-'Aṭṭār], vol. 5, p. 19

[22] Sahih al-Bukhari 5523; In-book reference: Book 72, Hadith 50; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 7, Book 67, Hadith 432; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/72/50

[23] Sahih al-Bukhari 5521; In-book reference: Book 72, Hadith 48; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 7, Book 67, Hadith 430; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/72/48

[24] Sahih al-Bukhari 5520; In-book reference: Book 72, Hadith 47; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 7, Book 67, Hadith 429; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/72/47

al-Aslami[25] , and Anas ibn Malik[26] which unanimously say that what the Prophet prohibited at Khaybar was the eating of donkey. None of them ever made mention of Mut'ah prohibition. Only the narration of Ali had additional interpolation of "mut'ah".

Most classical Ahlu-Sunnah scholars agreed that Prophet never prohibit Mut'ah at Khaybar. They argued that there were no Muslim women to perform Mut'ah with at Khaybar since the place was a Jewish land and permission to marry the people of the book only came much later after the conquest of Khaybar.[27]

Fourth Question:

Why didn't Ali give the acclaimed "farm of Fatimah" that Shi'a always claim (fadak) and hand it over to her heirs?

Shaykh Sadūq in his prestigious Al-'Illal Al-Sharai document few narrations that give direct answer to this very question. For example:

Shaykh Sadūq documents:

Ahmad Bin Ali Bin Ibrahim Bin Hashim narrated to us, from his father, from his father Ibrahim Bin Hashim, from

---

[25] Sahih al-Bukhari 4173; In-book reference : Book 64, Hadith 215; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 491; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/64/215

[26] Sahih al-Bukhari 4198; In-book reference: Book 64, Hadith 238; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 510 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/64/238

[27] Fath al-Bari sharh sahih al-bukhari (Dar al-rayan lil tarath; 1407 H), bab Kitab Nikah; footnote number 1, p. 74, hadith #4825

Muhammad Bin Abu Umeyr, from Ibrahim Al Karkhy who said:

قال: سألت ابا عبد الله " ع " فقلت له لاي علة ترك علي بن ابى طالب " ع " فدك لما ولى الناس فقال: للاقتداء برسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله لما فتح مكة وقد باع عقيل بن ابى طالب حدثنا احمد بن علي بن إبراهيم بن هاشم رحم داره فقيل له يارسول الله ألا ترجع إلى دارك؟ فقال صلى الله عليه وآله وهل ترك عقيل لنا دارا إنا أهل بيت لا نسترجع شيئا يؤخذ منا ظلما. فلذلك لم .يسترجع فدك لما ولى.

I asked Abu Abdullah (as), so I said to himasws, 'For which reason did Ali Bin Abu Talib (as) leave Fadak when he (as) ruled the people?' He (as) said: 'For (the sake of) following Rasool-Allah (saww), when he (saww) conquered Makkah, and Aqeel son of Abu Talibas had sold his (as) house. So, it was said to him (as), 'O Rasool-Allah (saww)! Will yousaww not go to your house?' So, he said: 'And has Aqeel left a house for us? We, the Ahl al-Bayt (People of the Household), do not retrieve anything which has been seized from us unjustly'. Thus, it was due to that, he (Ali) did not retrieve Fadak when he (as) ruled'.[28]

Fifth Question:

Why didn't Ali abrogate "as-Salatu khayrun mina Nawm" that Shi'a believed to be innovation?

Point one: The onus is on the Professor to give us one single authentic athar that "as-Salatu khayrun mina Nawm" was retained in the adhan during the reign of Imam Ali ibn Abi Taalib (peace be upon him).

---

[28] Ibn Babawayh (d. 380 H), Al-'Illal Al-Sharai, vol. 1, part 5, Chapter 124, pg. 5, hadith 2. For full details, see chapter forty (40) for discussion about *fadak*.

Point two: It is not that 'Shi'a believed,' "as-Salatu khayrun mina Nawm" in adhan was an innovation of the "companions," rather, it is truly an innovation of Umar ibn al-Khattab.

Imam Malik documents:

وَحَدَّثَنِي عَنْ مَالِكٍ، أَنَّهُ بَلَغَهُ أَنَّ الْمُؤَذِّنَ، جَاءَ إِلَى عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ يُؤْذِنُهُ لِصَلاَةِ الصُّبْحِ فَوَجَدَهُ نَائِمًا فَقَالَ الصَّلاَةُ خَيْرٌ مِنَ النَّوْمِ . فَأَمَرَهُ عُمَرُ أَنْ يَجْعَلَهَا فِي نِدَاءِ الصُّبْحِ

Yahya related to me from Malik that he had heard that the muadhdhin came to Umar ibn al-Khattab to call him to the subh prayer and found him sleeping, so he

said, "Prayer is better than sleep," and Umar ordered him to put that in the adhan for subh." [29]

If that was not an innovation, then what is it? Interestingly, there is another version of Sunni hadith (the hadith of Abu Mahdhurah – Sunan an-Nasa'I, hadith 647) which linked the phrase "as-Salatu khayrun mina Nawm" to the Prophet. This does not undo the problem, rather, exacerbate it in a contradictory manner.

Sixth Question: Why didn't Ali add "ash-Hadu anna Aliyyan waliyyullah" in the adhan? Our Professor claimed the phrase is part of "Shi'a religion".

---

[29] Malik ibn Anas, Al-Muwatta, book 3 Hadith 8; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 3, Hadith 8; Arabic reference: Book 8 Hadith 154; https://sunnah.com/malik/3/8

The Sunni believed that Imam Malik was a junior tabi'i who met sahabah, and lived in Madinah. The Maliki argued that Imam Malik stood a good chance to give the Sunnah amaliyyah of the Prophet as known by the people of Madinah.

Point one: Why would Ali add such phrase in the adhan? He was the Imam and true Khalifah whether he is accepted or not. Even if he is to add it, the people he governed never stop opposing and sabotaging his government from the beginning of his leadership until he was murdered. Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah documented [in al-Mussanaf] that Imam Ali once forbid people from praying tarawih in congregation during Ramadhan as it is an innovation to which these people caused commotion since they have used to such innovation for years as institutionalized by the second Caliph. Imam Ali had to leave them in their ignorance. Imam Ali's four years plus reign was plagued with three civil wars and series of disobedience by the Muslims.

Second point: Yes, Shi'a do regard the sentence "ash-Hadu anna Aliyyan waliyyullah – I bear witness that Ali is wali (Allah's representative in terms of authority over the believer) of Allah" as part of their "religion." In fact, that is what defined Shi'ism. However, we do not count it as part of adhan. We only treat it as a recommendation to be pronounced in adhan and iqaamat. Whether it is added to adhan or not does not affect salat in anyway.

Grand Ayatullah 'Ali Sistani writes:

الأذان والإقامة

(مسألة 77): يستحبّ الأذان قبل الإتيان بالصلوات اليوميّة، وكيفيّته

اللهُ أَكْبَرُ، اللهُ أَكْبَرُ، اللهُ أَكْبَرُ، اللهُ أَكْبَرُ.

أَشْهَدُ أَنْ لا إِلهَ إِلّا اللهُ، أَشْهَدُ أَنْ لا إِلهَ إِلّا اللهُ.

أَشْهَدُ أَنَّ مُحَمَّداً رَسُولُ اللهِ، أَشْهَدُ أَنَّ مُحَمَّداً رَسُولُ اللهِ.

حَيَّ عَلَى الصَّلاةِ، حَيَّ عَلَى الصَّلاةِ.

حَيَّ عَلَى الفَلاحِ، حَيَّ عَلَى الفَلاحِ.

حَيَّ عَلَى خَيْرِ العَمَلِ، حَيَّ عَلَى خَيْرِ العَمَلِ.

اللهُ أَكْبَرُ، اللهُ أَكْبَرُ.

لا إِلهَ إِلّا اللهُ، لا إِلهَ إِلّا اللهُ.

والشهادة لعلي (عليه السلام) بالولاية وإمرة المؤمنين مكمّلة للشهادة بالرسالة ومستحبّة في نفسها ولكنّها ليست جزءاً من الأذان.

Adhan and Iqamah

It is recommended to call to salat (Adhan) before performing the daily salat, and this is how it should be done:

Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar.

Ash'adu an la ilaha illah Allah, Ash'adu an la ilaha illah Allah

Ash'adu ana Muhammadan Rasulullah, Ash'adu ana Muhammadan Rasulullah

Hayya 'ala as-Salat, Hayya 'ala as-Salat

Hayya 'ala al-Falah, Hayya 'ala al-Falah

Hayya 'ala khayr al-'Amal, Hayya 'ala khayr al-'Amal

Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar

La ilaha illah Allah. [30]

This is the adhan as known by the Shi'ah. All the Shi'a jurists are unanimous that saying Ash'adu ana Aliyyan Waliyyullah - I bear witness that Ali is Allah's Waliyy is not a part of Adhan. For example, Ayatullah Ali Sistani (may Allah preserve him) says:

[30] https://www.sistani.org/arabic/book/24/1847/

والشهادة لعلي (عليه السلام) بالولاية وإمرة المؤمنين مكمّلة للشهادة بالرسالة ومستحبّة في نفسها ولكنّها ليست جزءاً من الأذان.

Testimony to Ali (peace be upon him) as guardian and command of the believers complements testimony to the message and is desirable in itself, but it is not part of the call to prayer.[31]

Salat starts with Takbiratul Ihram and ends with Salam. We have established (in chapter 1 and 5) the Wali-ship (wilayah – authority) of Ali ibn Abi Taalib after the authority of Allah and His Messenger over all the believers; therefore, inclusion of "ash-Hadu anna Aliyyan waliyyullah" in adhan as a recommended act is par with the Prophet's declaration at Ghadir khumm. This, compared to Umar's innovation of "as-Salatu khayrun mina nawm" that has no basis in the Qur'an and Prophetic sunnah, is obviously part of the deen.

Seventh Question: Why didn't Ali deviate from any of the things the previous Caliph did? Our professor then reasons, "Is this not a clear indication that Ali was a Sunni and not Shi'a? And that he has a complete loyalty and affection to those Caliphs that preceded him against your (Shia) insinuations?"

It is very obvious that our professor is unaware of several Ali's opposition to the practices of the previous Caliphs. If we are to mention all his opposition to their practices that have no basis in Islam, voluminous book will be written in the process. Suffice however is one golden example. Imam Nasai (d. 303 H) documents:

It was narrated that Al-Hakam said:

أَخْبَرَنَا إِسْحَاقُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ، قَالَ أَنْبَأَنَا أَبُو عَامِرٍ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ، عَنِ الْحَكَمِ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَلِيَّ بْنَ حُسَيْنٍ، يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ مَرْوَانَ، أَنَّ عُثْمَانَ،

[31] Ibid.

نَهَى عَنِ الْمُتْعَةِ، وَأَنْ يَجْمَعَ الرَّجُلُ بَيْنَ الْحَجِّ وَالْعُمْرَةِ فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ لَبَّيْكَ بِحَجَّةٍ وَعُمْرَةٍ مَعًا . فَقَالَ عُثْمَانُ أَتَفْعَلُهَا وَأَنَا أَنْهَى عَنْهَا فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ لَمْ أَكُنْ لأَدَعَ سُنَّةَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لأَحَدٍ مِنَ النَّاسِ

I heard 'Ali bin Husain narrating from Marwan, that 'Uthman FORBADE Mut'ah and joining Hajj and "Umrah. 'Ali said; 'Labbaika bi Hajjatin wa 'Umratin ma'an - Here I am, (O Allah) for Hajj and 'Umrah together'. Uthman said: 'Are you doing this when I have forbidden it?' 'Ali said; 'I will not give up the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah for any of the people.[32]

Ali ibn Abi Taalib did not only oppose the Caliphs' innovations and wrong judgements during their respective reigns but also tried to revive the Sunnah of the Prophet during his reign as people had forgotten many of it including salat [Bukhari Hadith 784, 826]. Indeed, Ali ibn Abi Taalib was a real "Sunni," meaning he adhered to the Sunnah of the Prophet throughout his life and never deviated. And those who love and accept Ali's leadership after the Prophet are his Shi'a. We end this reply by a mutawattir (recurrent) hadith. Imam Ibn Asakir, [33] for example, reports:

أخبرنا أبو العلاء صاعد بن أبي الفضل بن أبي عثمان الماليني أنا أبو محمد عبد الله بن أبي بكر بن أحمد السقطي نا أبو الفضل محمد بن أحمد بن محمد بن الجارود الحافظ إملاء أنا أبو محمد بن جعفر بن محمد بن أحمد بن محمد المعروف بابن المتيم الكاتب ببغداد نا أبو

---

[32] Sunan an-Nasa'i 2723; In-book reference : Book 24, Hadith 0; English translation : Vol. 3, Book 24, Hadith 2724; https://sunnah.com/urn/1078930

[33] Abū al-Qāsim 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. Habat Allāh: Ibn 'Asākir, Tārīkh Dimashq (Dār al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: 'Amr b. Gharāmah al-'Amrawī], vol. 42, pp. 33

محمد القاسم بن جعفر بن محمد بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عمر بن علي بن أبي طالب حدثني أبي جعفر بن محمد عن أبيه محمد بن عبد الله عن أبي عبد الله جعفر بن محمد الصادق عن محمد بن علي الباقر عن أبيه علي بن الحسين عن أبيه الحسين بن علي عن أبيه أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب قال ... قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يا علي هم أهل ولايتك وشيعتك ومحبوك يحبونك بحبي ويحبوني بحب الله هم الفائزون يوم القيامة

Abu al-'Ala Sa'id b. Abi al-Faḍl b. Abi 'Uthman al-Malini – Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah b. Abi Bakr b. Ahmad al-Saqti – Abu al-Faḍl Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Muhammad b. al-Jarud al-Hafiz – Abu Muhammad b. Ja'far b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Muhammad, better known as Ibn al-Matim the Scribe – Abu Muhammad al-Qasim b. Ja'far b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. 'Umar b. 'Ali b. Abi Talib – my father Ja'far b. Muhammad – his father Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah – 'Abu 'Abd Allah Ja'far b. Muhammad al-Sadiq – Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Baqir – his father 'Ali b. al-Husayn – his father al-Husayn b. 'Ali – his father, Amir al-Muminin 'Ali b. Abi Talib:

... The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, "O 'Ali! They are the believers in your wilayah and your Shi'ah and lovers. They love you on account of their love for me, and they love me on account of their love for Allah. They will be the successful ones on the Day of al-Qiyamah."

The Ahl al-Sunnah scholars of hadith have actually treated this hadith polemically, and isolatedly grading it as "da'eef – weak" or fabrication. However, it is a mutawattir hadith that can not be graded with such epithets. It is an authentic hadith.

Imam Hakim al-Haskani (d. 490 H) in his Shawahid Tanzil (vol. 2, p. 461) has recorded this hadith through a

chain from Ibn Abbas; Al-Khawarizmi in his al-Manaqib Amir al-Mumineen (p. 183-184; p. 319, p. 323) via the chain of Anas ibn Malik, and via the chain of Sa'eed ibn Jubayr. Also, Ibn Maghazili al-Shafi'i in his Manaqib (p. 157 – 158) cites another chain ending with Jabir ibn Abdullah al-Ansari. Imam Tabarani in his Mu'jam al-Awsat (vol. 7, p. 343) through the chain of Abu Hurayrah; Tarikh Ibn Asakir (vol. 42, p. 333) via the chain of Umm Salamah; Imam Hakim in his al-Mustadrak ala Sahihayn (vol. 3, p. 174 – 175) also recorded via the chain of Mayna ibn Abi Mayna. Yet, we still have more sahabah who narrated various variation of this hadith giving a total number of 12 sahabah, more than minimum required number for tawattur.

Imam Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani writes on hadith like this:

لأن التواتر لا يشترط ثقة رجاله ولا عدالتهم وانما العمدة على ورود الخبر بعدد يستحيل فى العادة تواطؤهم على الكذب.

For a mutawatir hadith, the reliability or justice of the narrators is irrelevant. Its authenticity only depends on the multiplicity of narrators, to a number that clearly removes the possibililty of any collusion to lie.[34]

---

[34] Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, Al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1415 H), Vol. 2, p. 252

CHAPTER THREE

WILL IMAM AL-MAHDI RULE BY JEWISH LAW?

Question 3:

Kulayni, in Al-Kafi (1/397), has a chapter that he titled: "The Rise of the Imam (Establishing an Authority) Will Be Governed by the Laws of the Jews." He proceeds by saying: "...they will never request evidence or witnesses (in dealing with issues regarding evidence)" (then the murder of anyone who is not a Shi'ite will be rampant, whether he has a convincing argument or not in any lawsuit).

In the book "Bihar al-Anwar" (52/354), Majlisi said: "When Mahdi appears, he will come with a new religion, a new book (scripture), and new laws/decrees." Nu'main also corroborated this in the book "Kitab al-Ghaybah," pp. 154. It was reported in the aforementioned book that Ja'far al-Sadiq said: "I can forecast/prophesy when Mahdi will appear in the Ka'bah between Rukn al-Yamani and Maqam Ibrahim; he will be pledging to people to follow a new scripture and not the Qur'an." This was reported in the book "Bihar al-Anwar" (52/135).

However, Majlisi, in the above book (Bihar al-Anwar), said: "When Mahdi appears, by the time people notice how he will commit murder, they will wish he had never appeared." He continued: "...the majority of citizens will doubt his blood relation to the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, because if he is a member of the Prophet's household, he is bound to be merciful."

My question here is: Why is it that if your Mahdi appears, he will be governed by the laws/decrees of the Jews? Is it not true that Prophet Muhammad, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam's decree has abrogated all laws before it? Why should they leave the Qur'an aside? Is this not an indication that the origin of your religion is from Judaism, combined with Magian (pagan) beliefs, wrapped in paganism and named Islam

THE REPLY

A sincere scholar who wishes to take his opponent head on must be able to read and quote the opponent's book(s) accurately, bring their leading scholars' verdicts and interpretations. Once these demands are met, then opposing argument(s) and objections can be advanced. It is crystal clear that Professor Muhammad Mansur is not of the sincere academic scholars. He simply wants to give a dog a bad name to hang him.

First, there is no chapter in al-Kafi by the title "the rise of Imam (establishing an authority) will lead by the laws of the Jews". This title is either fabricated by our Prof. or copy-pasted without verification. The title of the chapter is:

باب في الائمة عليهم السلام انهم إذا ظهر أمرهم حكموا
بحكم داود وآل داود و...لا يسألون البينة، [عليهم السلام]

"Chapter on the Imams, peace be upon them, when they will rise with divine authority: they will judge among people as Dawud and family of Dawud had done that they will not ask any witness to testify [peace be upon them]"[35]

Interestingly, the Prof. was surprised with this headline which led to his comment when he says, "(then the murder of whoever is not a shi'ite will be rampant whether he is the one with convincing argument or not in any lawsuit)." In sha Allah, this will be responded to shortly.

Second, the Prof. quoted two ahadith from Bihar al-Anwar of Allamah Majlisi. Here are the full ahadith:

'Allāmah al-Majlisī records:

---

[35] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, *al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī* (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah; 3rd edition) [annotator: 'Alī Akbar al-Ghiffārī], kitab al-Hujjah [book of proof/divine authority], chapter 99

Al-Ghaybah of al-Nu'mānī: Through this chain from al-Bazanṭī – 'Āṣim b. Ḥumayd al-Ḥanāṭ – Abū Baṣīr: Abū Ja'far, peace be upon him, said:

"The Qāim will rise with a new command, a new book, new judgments. He will be harsh towards the Arabs. His affair will be nothing but the sword. He will not ask anyone to repent and he, for the sake of Allāh, will not be moved by the criticisms of critics."[36]

This hadith is ḍa'īf [weak] according to Āyatullāh Muhsinī.27 However, the hadith has another chain (quoted again by the Prof.):

Al-Ghaybah of al-Nu'mānī: Ibn 'Uqdah – Aḥmad b. Yūsuf – Ibn Mahrān – Ibn al-Baṭāinī – his father and Wuhayb b. Ḥafṣ – Abū Baṣīr – Abū 'Abd Allāh, peace be upon him:

My father, peace be upon him, said to me: "... It is like I am looking at him between al-Rukn and al-Makām, receiving the pledge of allegiance of the people upon a new book. He will be harsh against the Arabs. Woe unto the transgressors among the Arabs from an evil that has become imminent." [37]

This one also is ḍa'īf according to Āyatullāh Muhsinī.[38]

One of many problems of these two ahadith is that they are quoted from kitab al-Ghaybah, a book attributed to Nu'mani. This book happens to be a weak book. Its author is unknown. It has no authenticated chain that reaches the supposedly author, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin

---

[36] Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmi'ah li Durar Akhbār al-Aimah al-Aṭhār* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī; 3rd edition, 1403 H), vol. 52, p. 354, Ch. 27, # 114

[37]Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, *Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār* (Beirut: Muasassat al-'Ārif li alMaṭbū'āt; 2nd edition, 1426 H), vol. 2, p. 233

[38] Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, *Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār* (Beirut: Muasassat al-'Ārif li alMaṭbū'āt; 2nd edition, 1426 H), vol. 2, p. 233

Ibraheem bin Ja'far al-Katib an-Numani. Strictly speaking in the science of hadith, such book is classified a da'if [weak] book.

Unknowingly, the Prof. said, "Nu'mani also corroborated this in the book of "kitabul Ghaibah." Rather, it was Allamah Majlisi that quoted those aforementioned ahadith from kitab al-Ghaybah. So, the former can never corroborate the later. Another problem of the hadith is the weakness of its chain of transmitters. Kindly read further detail in the Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār of Ayatullah Muhsini whom we had quoted for weakening those ahadith. In conclusion, those two ahadith are of no probative value.

Third, the other statement attributed to "Bihar al-Anwar" that "when Mahdi appears ... he will commit murder ... they (people) will wish he had never appeared"[39] are fanciful fabrications of the Professor.

REPLY TO THE MAIN QUESTION

Again, the Prof's questions read:

My question here is, why is it that if your Mahdi appears he will be governed by the laws/decrees of the Jews? Is it not that prophet Muhammad; sallahu alaihi wassalam decree has abrogated all laws before it? Why should they leave the Qur'an aside? Is this not a pointer that the origin of your Religion is from Jewish Religion joined with Magus (paganism), wrapped with Paganism and named Islam?

Our replies are as follow:

First, there is nowhere it is said "Mahdi will govern by the law/decrees of the Jews". What authentic ahadith say are

---

[39] Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, *Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār* (Beirut: Muasassat al-'Ārif li alMaṭbū'āt; 2nd edition, 1426 H), vol. 2, p. 227

totally different. For brevity, Allamah al-Majlisi documents:

Ikmāl al-Dīn: Through this chain, from Abān b. Taghlib:

Abū 'Abd Allāh, peace be upon him, said: "There will be in your mosque, that is the mosque of Kūfa, 313 men. The people of Makkah will know that they (i.e. the 313 men) are not descended from their (i.e. the Makkans') fathers and ancestors. They (i.e. the 313 men) will have swords; on each sword will be inscribed a statement which will open one thousand (other) statements. Then, Allāh the Most Blessed and the Most High will send a wind which will call in every valley: 'This is the Mahdī.' He will judge with the judgment of Dāwud and Sulaymān, peace be upon them both: he will not demand for evidence on it."[40]

Al-Ḥāj Muḥammad Zakariyā says about the hadith: Its chain is ṣaḥīḥ.

The above hadith (with others of its genre) says, "he will judge with the judgment of Dawud and Sulayman," and not "he will govern by the law/decrees of the Jews" as misinterpreted by the Professor.

Question 1:

What is the judgement of Dawud and Sulayman?

The hadith gave answer saying, "he will not demand for evidence on it."

Question 2:

Why won't he demand for evidence on it (his judgement)?

Sheikh al-Kulayni documents another hadith which answers the question:

---

[40] Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmi'ah li Durar Akhbār al-Aimah al-Aṭhār* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī; 3rd edition, 1403 H), vol. 52, p. 286, Ch. 26, # 19

Muḥammad – Aḥmad b. Muḥammad – Ibn Maḥbūb – Hishām b. Sālim – 'Ammār al- Sabāṭī:

I said to Abū 'Abd Allāh, peace be upon him, "With what do you judge when you judge?" He said, "With the Judgment of Allāh and the judgment of Dāwud, for whenever something is presented to us which is not with us, the Holy Spirit bestows it to us.[41]

The hadith is Muwaththaq.

Al-Majlisī confirms this:

"Know that what is apparent from these reports is that the Qāim, peace be upon him, when he reappears, will judge based upon what he will know of the actual truth, and not with evidence. As for the Imāms before him, peace be upon them, they used to give judgments based upon what was apparent."[42]

Al-Majlisī again writes:

(the judgment of Dāwud) MEANING, judgment based the upon actual truth. What is apparent from the (other) reports is that Dāwud, peace be upon him, did NOT always do this. Rather, he (only) judged with it on some occasions." [43]

Question 3:

---

[41] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, *al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī* (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah; 3rd edition) [annotator: 'Alī Akbar al-Ghiffārī], vol. 1, p. 398, # 3

[42] Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Mir-āt al-'Uqūl fi Sharḥ Akhbār Āl al-Rasūl* (Tehran: Dār alKutub al-Islāmīyyah) [annotator: Sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥusaynī al-Amīnī], vol. 4, p. 303

[43] Ibid, vol. 4, p. 303

Was this style of judgement practiced by Muhammad ibn Abdullah, peace be upon him and his progeny?

Imam Muslim document:

'Alī b. Ḥajar al-Sa'dī – 'Alī b. Mushir – Hishām b. 'Urwah – his father – 'Āishah:

Hind bint 'Utba, the wife of Abū Sufyān, came to the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, and said, "O Messenger of Allāh, verily, Abū Sufyān is a miser, and he does not give me money that is sufficient for me and my children, except whatever I took from his wealth without his knowledge. Is there a sin upon me in that?" The Messenger of Allāh, eace be upon him, said, "Take reasonably from his wealth what is sufficient for you and your children." [44]

In the above hadith, Prophet neither called Abu Sufyan for his own side of the story nor call for witnesses. This is Prophet Dawud and Prophet Sulayman's style of judgement. Of course, just like the previous Prophets, our Prophet only used this style occasionally.

Question 4:

Prophets are understandable as they received wahy (inspiration) from time to time. What about non-Prophets especially as Abu Abdillah (Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq) says, "the holy spirit bestows it to us?"

---

[44] Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī al-Naysābūrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 3, p. 1338, # 1714 (7)

Qur'an clearly states about how the Hawariyun[45] and mother of Musa[46] received wahy (inspiration). Even Hazrat Maryam[47] was visited by angel and received wahy.

Lastly, Allah specifically talks about the Imams (from the progeny of Ibrahim):

وَجَعَلْنَاهُمْ أَئِمَّةً يَهْدُونَ بِأَمْرِنَا وَأَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْهِمْ فِعْلَ الْخَيْرَاتِ وَإِقَامَ الصَّلَاةِ وَإِيتَاء الزَّكَاةِ وَكَانُوا لَنَا عَابِدِينَ

"And We appointed them Imams, guiding by Our command, and We sent wahy to them to do good deeds, and to keep up salat, and pay al-zakat. And they were worshippers of Us."[48]

This type of Wahy is known as non-scriptural wahy as opposed to scriptural wahy that is exclusive to the Messengers of Allah.

By now the Prof. should have assessed himself if he is a truth-seeker. "Shi'a" Mahdi is not coming to "govern with Jewish law", he is not coming "with new law or establish a new religion," he is not coming to "abandon the Quran", he is not coming "to murder non-Shi'a", and the Shi'a has nothing to do with "paganism or Jewish-sm". Rather, Muhammad al-Muntazar al-Mahdi (peace be upon him) is coming to establish justice on earth.

Imam Abu Dawud documents:

---

[45] Sura al-Maidah: 111

[46] Sura al-Qasas: 7

[47] Sura Maryam: 16 – 21

[48] Sura al-Anbiya: 73

عَنْ عَلِيٍّ، - رضى الله تعالى عنه - عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ: لَوْ لَمْ يَبْقَ مِنَ الدَّهْرِ إِلاَّ يَوْمٌ لَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ رَجُلاً مِنْ أَهْلِ بَيْتِي يَمْلأُهَا عَدْلاً كَمَا مُلِئَتْ جَوْرًا

Narrated Ali ibn AbiTalib:

The Prophet said: If only one day of this time (world) remained, Allah would raise up a man from my Ahl al-Bayt who would fill this earth with justice as it has been filled with oppression.[49]

Grade: Sahih (Al-Albani)

[49] Sunan Abi Dawud 4283; In-book reference : Book 38, Hadith 5English translation : Book 37, Hadith 4270; https://sunnah.com/abudawud/38/5

CHAPTER FOUR

SHI'ISM AND PERSIAN LANGUAGE

Question 4:

What is the relationship between your religion (Shi'ism) and the Persian language? This is because you completely disregard the Arabic language and give high esteem to Persian and their language above any other language or person. Before you dismiss this, let me provide an example that will clarify my intent. Your books reveal that if your Mahdi appears, he will murder the Quraysh and the Arabs. Furthermore, among his names is "Kisra al-Majus," the king of pagans! You already confess that "Chosroes," the King of Persia who tore the letter of the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, out of disrespect, will dwell in hellfire; yet hellfire is prohibited against him.

However, your books also give more priority to Salman al-Farsi over almost all the companions of the Prophet. Abu Lu'lu'ah, a pagan who killed Umar, earns great respect in your doctrines, and you also visit his graveyard. Al-Gharithi, in the introduction/preface of his book "Aqd al-Durar fi Baqri Badri Umar," said that Abu Lu'lu'ah is entitled to Allah's mercy even though he is not a Muslim. Visiting his graveyard and praying for him are among the great deeds that earn rewards because of the act he committed in murdering Umar, the son-in-law of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam.

The place of Karbala, located in Iraq (Persia), is considered better than Makkah and Madinah according to your doctrines. This has reached the extent that the status of the Ka'bah in comparison with Karbala is like what a needle carries of water from an ocean; this is the assertion of Majlisi in Bihar al-Anwar (98/106).

Indeed, today the Iranian nation has adopted Persian as its official language as provided under Article 3 of the Iranian constitution. This shouldn't be a surprise considering that

most of the recognized and authorized scholars of Shi'ism who are allowed to give their respective opinions on religious matters are foreigners (Ajami), meaning they don't speak Arabic. Scholars like Khomeini, Khamenei, Rafsanjani, Khatami, and even Sistani, "Sayyid al-Muhaqqiq," the real leader of Shi'ite scholars today—all of them do not speak Arabic! Just a few years ago, Al-Jazeera channel had an interactive session with the leader of Nigerian Shi'ites, but Arabic was translated for him and he responded in English! Don't you notice that?! Before then, he confessed that he could not read Arabic text without vowel signs!

THE REPLY

If the above "question" is truly written by a professor, then academics is at great risk. How some scholars lose their common sense when it comes to the issue of Shi'ism and Iran is beyond explanation. Indeed, hatred and ignorance are obstacles to reasoning. Naturally, this kind of "question" should not be dignified with reply if not that we have promised not to leave any stone unturned.

First, the Prof. continues to label Shi'ism as "religion" different from Islam. Although we have given and proven what Shi'ism is but we must add that what makes a person Muslim is the apparent declaration of shahadatain – la ilaha ilah Allah, Muhammad Rasulullah. Whoever confesses this is a Muslim and under the religion of Islam. Obviously, the Prof. knew this but his heart seemed to be poisoned with hatred of Shi'ism hence, the extent of his propaganda.

Second, there is no relationship between Shi'ism and Persian language other than excellent relationship and great collaboration. Shi'ism started in Arabia during the very lifetime of the holy Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny. We have initially quoted a mutawattir hadith signifying that Prophet was the first to have used the term "Shi'a of Ali." And the first sets of Ali's Shi'a were no other than the companions of the Prophet majority of who were Arabs.

Imam al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani defines Shi'ism:

"Shi'sm is the love of 'Ali and placing of him over the sahabah [except Abubakr and Umar only]. Whoever places him above Abubakr and Umar, such is an extremist in his Shi'ism, and he is called a Rafidi. If he does not, then he is only a Shi'i. ..."[50]

Who were the first sets of "Shi'a and Rafidah"? An ace Sunni Imam, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (d. 463H) writes:

"Salman, Abu Dharr, al-Miqdad, Khabab, Jabir (b. Abdullah al-Ansari), Abu Sa'id al-Khudri and Zayd b. Arqam narrated that 'Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, was the first to accept Islam, and they considered him the most superior (among the Sahaabah)"[51]

In fact, a Sahabi by the name, Abu al-Tufayl ['Amir b. Wathilah b. 'Abd Allah b. Amr al-Laythi al-Kanani al-Hijazi] is described by al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani thus:

"Abu Umar said: He accepted the Merit of Abu Bakr and 'Umar but he considered 'Ali to be the most superior."[52]

In fact, the "Rawafidh" were too numerous to count amongst the tabi'een. Interestingly, over 90% of them were Arabians who spoke Arabic. In the abovementioned name of the foremost Shi'ah, only the sahabi Salman al-Farisi was of Persian origin. Shi'ism had existed in Arabia for centuries before Islam in general even came to Iran. Officially, Iran as a nation converted to Shi'ism (from Sunnism) in 1501. Unfortunately, propagandists and ignoramus haters continue to feed their victims with lies

---

[50] Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *Hadi al-Sari Muqaddimah Fath al-Bari* (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi; 1st Edition, 1408H), p. 460

[51] Yusuf ibn Abdallah ibn Mohammed ibn Abd al-Barr, *al-Isti'ab fi Ma'rifat al-Ashab* (Beirut: Dar al-Jil; 1st edition, 1412H), vol. 3, p. 1090, #1855

[52] Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Illmiyyah, 1st edition, 1415H), vol. 7, p.193, #10166

that Shi'ism was a product of Jew, and the fools amongst them will even say it was originated in Persia, Iran.

Interestingly, 90% of ancient and celebrated Sunni scholars were Persians (Iranians). The likes of Imam al-Bukhari, Imam Muslim, Imam Ghazali, Imam Fakhru deen ar-Razi and so on. Some of them cannot even speak Arabic language properly but were masters of Arabic grammar yet they were able to serve Islam. If Iran decided to adopt their mother tongue – Far'si as their official language over a borrowed Arabic language, how's that a sin or a problem? In fact, the services the Persian scholars had rendered into Islam are incomparable.

Now, we ask our Prof. if Iranian Shi'a scholars decided to speak Persian instead of Arabic and even gave it more priority, where is it written to be a sin or lack of Iman (faith)? Then, what about Arabian Shi'a scholars who only speak Arabic? How can the Prof. mix nationalism with religion? Islam is a universal religion despite the fact that Arabian land was where it originated. Arabic language and culture preceded "Islam".

Therefore, if a non-Arab nation accepts Islam, that doesn't mean her language and culture should be changed to that of Arab as well. Islam respects all races. In fact, Quran says part of the signs of Allah is our segregation into different races, colors and languages. So, what is this foolish idea of equating Islam to speaking Arabic language? Yet, many of the greatest Shi'a books were written and taught in Arabic both in Iran and other Shi'a dominated countries. From the earliest Shia books like Kitab al-Kaafi, Man la yahduruhul faqih, al-Istibsar, Bihar al-Anwar etc to modern books like Tafsir al-Mizan, Tahrir al-wasila and so on, all were written in pure Arabic language by their respective Persian authors.

Third, the Professor made reference to "your books revealed that if your Mahdi appears, he will murder the Quraysh, and murder the Arabs". We challenge the Prof. to prove the authenticity of that hadith in our book.

The hadith is da'if jiddan (very weak) to start with. Besides, why did the Prof. decide to leave Shi'a authentic ahadith which state that Mahdi is from the descendants of Fatimah, he is from the Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet? Has this not made him a Qurayshi and Arab man? Why is the Prof. trying to play "Persian-Iranian Mahdi" against the Arabs? Even if the fake hadith quoted by the Prof is assumed to be true, the fact that Shi'a believed Mahdi to be an Arab from the Quraysh suggests that if he will kill "Arabs or Qurayshi", it can only be the evil unbelievers and oppressors amongst them just like his forefathers – the Prophet and Ali ibn Abi Taalib – killed them in battles.

Fourth, other points raised by the Prof. viz; "Chosroes (Persian king), Abu Lu'lu, al-Garithi and al-Ahqaqi (whoever they are)" are too despicable and worthless to be discussed.

Fifth, our Professor claims that Shi'a books praise Salman al-Farisi than almost other companions of the Prophet. That is another exaggeration of our professor. Aside the ahl al-Bayt, all the Shia from amongst the companions of the Prophet were revered, not just Salman in particular. However, Salman occupied a status far higher than other companions. For example, the noble Prophet was reported to have said, "Salman is from us the Ahl al-Bayt." Which of the other notable Sahabi acquired this noble status?

Imam Muslim and Imam Tirmidhi also document a hadith which reads:

Narrated Abu Hurairah:

عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ، قَالَ كُنَّا جُلُوسًا عِنْدَ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم إِذْ نَزَلَتْ عَلَيْهِ سُورَةُ الْجُمُعَةِ فَلَمَّا قَرَأَ { وَآخَرِينَ مِنْهُمْ لَمَّا يَلْحَقُوا بِهِمْ} قَالَ رَجُلٌ مَنْ هَؤُلاَءِ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ فَلَمْ يُرَاجِعْهُ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم حَتَّى سَأَلَهُ مَرَّةً أَوْ مَرَّتَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلاَثًا - قَالَ - وَفِينَا سَلْمَانُ الْفَارِسِيُّ - قَالَ - فَوَضَعَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَدَهُ عَلَى سَلْمَانَ ثُمَّ قَالَ لَوْ كَانَ الإِيمَانُ عِنْدَ الثُّرَيَّا لَنَالَهُ رِجَالٌ مِنْ هَؤُلاَءِ

> *Some people among the companions of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: 'O Messenger of Allah! Who are these people whom Allah mentioned, that if we turn away they would replace us, then they would not be like us?' He said: "And Salman was beside the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), so the Messenger of Allah patted Salman's thigh and said: 'This one and his companions, and by the One in whose Hand is my soul! If faith were suspended from Pleiades, then it would be reached by men from Persia."*[53]

According to this hadith, Salman and his fellow Persians will preserve Islam. Allahu Akbar!

Lastly on the issue of Karbala. Apart from the fact that Kar'bala is a sacred place, why did Shi'a continue to go to Makkah and Madina to perform Hajj if their belief was that Kar'bala is better than those two holy sites?

For a fact, Iranian Shi'a usually have the second or third largest Hajj caravan yearly to Makkah. Why can't they keep their money and go to nearby Iraq to visit Karbala if their belief was as erroneously stated by the Prof. who wilfully uses any Shia hadith with no verification or proper understanding?

If according to the Prophet, the sanctity of the blood of a believer is greater than the sanctity of the holy kaaba[54] (in Makkah), then why is it difficult to digest that Karbala where the leader of the youth of paradise and martyrs was buried is probably greater than Kaaba?

---

[53] Sahih Muslim 2546 b; In-book reference : Book 44, Hadith 327; English translation : Book 31, Hadith 6178 https://sunnah.com/muslim/44/327; Tirmidhi, vol. 5 Book 44, Hadith 3260; Arabic reference; Book 47 Hadith 3569; https://sunnah.com/urn/642950

[54] Narrated by Ibn Majah Hadith 3932; The hadith is authenticated by Al-Albani (Sahih at-Targeeb 2/630)

Imam Abi Ya'la records the sacredness of the land of Karbala:

Narrated Anas ibn Malik: "The angel of rain asked his Lord permission to visit the Prophet, peace be upon him. He gave (the angel) permission and this day he (the

Prophet) was with Umm Salamah, the mother of Believers. The Prophet told her, 'Guard the door and do not let anyone come in.' He said: "While she was at the door, Hussein ibn Ali burst into the room. So the Prophet began to hug him and kiss him. The angel said: 'Do you love him?' He said: "Yes". The angel said: "Your Ummah (nation) will kill him. He said: "If you wish, I will show you the place in which they will kill him." So he took a handful of soil from the place in which he will be killed and he showed it. It was "Sahla" or red soil.' So Umm Salamah took it, and collected it on her clothes.

Thaabit says: "We would say that it was from Karbala.[55]

The commentator says: In Musnad Ahmad, it says, "he struck his hand and brought red sand." Comments: The chain of narrators is good.

Is Karbala more sacred than Makkah and Madina? If it is so, then in what sense? Is the Ziyarat to Karbala more meritorious than obligatory Hajj to Makkah? If it is so, that doesn't mean Hajj (an obligatory act) will be abandoned for a recommended act. And of course, there are lots of recommended acts that are more meritorious than obligatory acts but that doesn't mean obligatory acts will be abandoned. These are extensive discussions beyond the scope of this book. Even if Shi'a belief is that Karbala is more sacred than Makkah and Madina, where is it stated that such belief is tantamount to kufr (disbelief) or nifaq (hypocrisy)? Why do people leave obligatory matters and delve into unnecessary issues to cause fasad (tribulation)?!

---

[55] Abu Ya'la Muhammad b. al-Husayn b. al-Farra, Musnad (Maktab Rushd: Dar al-Mamun li Turath, 1st edition, 1430 H)[annotator: Hussein Salim Asad], vol. 6, pg. 129, Hadith No.3402.

ISSUES ON IMAMAH (LEADERSHIP)

CHAPTER FIVE

IMAMAH IN THE QUR'AN AND HADITH (1)

The professor writes:

The Religion of Shi'ism is based on the doctrine that Aliyu bin Abi Talib radiyallahu Anhu is the first successor or rather leader (Khalifah).... This issue regarding leadership is of utmost importance to the Shi'ite, because they take it as the greatest pillar of Islam which the other pillars can't stand if it is not established, they reached to the extent of saying that it is even more than prophet-hood in importance.

Question 5:

Why is this great pillar of religion not mentioned in the Qur'an, unlike the other pillars that you think are not as important as it (Imamah)?

Allah has mentioned many things in His detailed book (the Qur'an). Let's take prayer as an example; not even the prayer itself, purity, ablution, ceremonial washing, qibla, or even excrement was discussed in the Qur'an.

Furthermore, what is prohibited or otherwise is mentioned and discussed in the Qur'an, the blessed book, as Allah says: "When He has explained to you in detail what is forbidden to you—except under compulsion of necessity..." (Q6:119).

However, not even things that are compulsory or recommended, nor those that are discouraged, are discussed in the Qur'an. Topics like loans and hunting have almost four verses revealed about them.

Why was there not a verse revealed to declare the leadership of Ali? This is evident because there is no verse that shows Ali to be the first leader of the Muslim

community after the demise of the Prophet. Why is Ali's name not mentioned in the Qur'an while the name of Zayd is very clear in Surah Al-Ahzab?

It's a known fact that Shi'ite scholars have a consensus that Ali's name is provided in hundreds of Qur'anic verses but was removed by the companions. This is clear in their holy book, Al-Kafi. A million-dollar question here is: Where is the safety and protection Allah has promised regarding the Qur'an?

THE REPLY

AL-WILAYAH

First, in Shi'i authentic ahadith which constitutes the Shi'ah beliefs, Islam is established upon five (5) pillars. Sheikh al-Kulayni (d. 329 H) documents:

عَلِيُّ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ وَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الصَّلْتِ جَمِيعاً عَنْ حَمَّادِ بْنِ عِيسَى عَنْ حَرِيزِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ عَنْ زُرَارَةَ عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ (عليه السلام) قَالَ بُنِيَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى خَمْسَةِ أَشْيَاءَ عَلَى الصَّلَاةِ وَ الزَّكَاةِ وَ الْحَجِّ وَ الصَّوْمِ وَ الْوَلَايَةِ قَالَ زُرَارَةُ فَقُلْتُ وَ أَيُّ شَيْءٍ مِنْ ذَلِكَ أَفْضَلُ فَقَالَ الْوَلَايَةُ أَفْضَلُ لِأَنَّهَا مِفْتَاحُهُنَّ وَ الْوَالِي هُوَ الدَّلِيلُ عَلَيْهِنَّ ...

Ali ibn Ibrahim has narrated from his father and 'Abd Allah ibn al-Salt all of them from Hammad ibn 'Isa from Hariz ibn 'Abd Allah from Zurara:

Abu Ja'far (peace be upon him) has said, 'Islam is based on five issues. It is based on prayer (salat), charity (al-Zakat), Hajj, Fasting (sawm) and al-Wilayah (divine authority).' Zurara has said, 'I then asked the Imam, "Which of these is more important than the others?"' The Imam said, 'Al-Wilayah is more important. It is the key to

the others. The person who possesses Divine Authority is the guide to the other principles.'..."[56]

Allamah al-Majlisi said: It is Sahih/Authentic (صحيح)

In the view of Shi'ah and non-Shi'ah alike especially the antagonists, when we talk about al-Wilayah, their understanding is "Imamah and Khilafah of the Ahl al-Bayt"; but the non-Shi'ah often ask about "the Shahadatayn" which is what they have in their own hadith[57] in lieu of the Shi'ah "al-Wilayah" even though the Shi'ah also have hadiths that express "the Shahadatayn" and "al-Wilayah" as part of the five pillars of Islam. For example, Shaykh Al-Kulayni documents:

عَلِيُّ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عِيسَى عَنْ يُونُسَ بْنِ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ عَنْ عَجْلانَ أَبِي صَالِحٍ قَالَ قُلْتُ لأَبِي عَبْدِ الله (عَلَيهِ السَّلام) أَوْقِفْنِي عَلَى حُدُودِ الإِيمَانِ فَقَالَ شَهَادَةُ أَنْ لا إِلَهَ إِلا الله وَأَنَّ مُحَمَّداً رَسُولُ الله وَالإِقْرَارُ بِمَا جَاءَ بِهِ مِنْ عِنْدِ الله وَصَلَوَاتُ الْخَمْسِ وَأَدَاءُ الزَّكَاةِ وَصَوْمُ شَهْرِ رَمَضَانَ وَحِجُّ الْبَيْتِ وَوَلايَةُ وَلِيِّنَا وَعَدَاوَةُ عَدُوِّنَا وَالدُّخُولُ مَعَ الصَّادِقِينَ.

Ali ibn Ibrahim has narrated from Muhammad ibn 'Isa from Yunus ibn 'Abd al- Rahman from 'Ajlan ibn Salih who has said the following: "I requested Abu 'Abdillah: 'Teach me, please, the principles of beliefs. The Imam said, 'They are: to testify and affirm that there is no one who deserves to be worshipped except Allah, to testify and affirm that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and to affirm that whatever he has taught is from Allah. (It is of the principles of beliefs) to affirm and accept that there is

---

[56] Muhammad Ibn Yaq'ub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi*, Volume 2, Chapter 13, Hadith No. 5; Kitab al-Iman wa al-kufr

[57] For example: Kitab al-Iman in Sahih al-Bukhari, hadith No. 8; In-book reference: Book 2, Hadith 1; USC-MSA web (English) reference: vol. 1, Book 2, Hadith 8: https://sunnah.com/bukhari/2/1

prayer five times every day. (It is of the principles of beliefs) to pay Zakat (charity), to fast in the month of Ramadan and to perform Hajj of the House (of Allah). (It is of the principles of beliefs) to love those who love us (A 'immah from the family of the Messenger of Allah), to disown our enemies and to become part of the group of the truthful ones. (All such issues are of principles and obligatory matters)."[58]

Allamah Baqir al-Majlisi: Sahih (authentic)

Therefore, this hadith has dispelled the rumor or insinuation or ignorance of the antagonist that the Shi'ah do not have or have replaced "the Shahadatayn" in the five pillars of Islam. It is to be noted that "al-Wilayah" became obligatory and institutionalised after the death of the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny), hence, the reason why some Shi'ah ahadith do not have "the Shahadatayn" in the pillar of Islam since people already believe in "the Shahadatayn". Yet, it is imperative to explain the concept of al-Wilayah.

Al-Wilayah is a concept, belief, ideology and acceptance which Allah expresses in His glorious book:

إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ

Only Allah is your Wali and His Apostle and those who believe, those who keep up prayers and pay the poor-rate while they bow."[Surah al-Maidah: 55]

The grand Salafi Sheikh, Salih al-Uthaymeen gives us the meaning of Wali as used in this noble verse:

ويستفاد من أثر بن عباس رضى الله عنهما : أن لله تعالى أولياء ، وهو ثابت بنص القرآن ، قال تعالى: (الله ولي الذين آمنوا) (البقرة: 257)

---

[58] Muhammad Ibn Yaq'ub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi*, Volume 2, Chapter 13, Hadith No. 2; Kitab al-Iman wa al-kufr

وقال تعالى : (إنما وليكم الله ورسوله والذين آمنوا) (المائدة: 55)
فلله أولياء يتولون أمره ويقيمون دينه ، وهو يتولاهم بالمعونة
والتسديد والحفظ والتوفيق ، والميزان لهذه الولاية قوله تعالى (أَلا إِنَّ
أَوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ لا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ) (يونس:62)

It is understood from the narration of Ibn Abbas, may God be pleased with them both: that Allah Almighty has Awliya, and it is proven by the text of the Qur'an: The Almighty said: (Allah is the Wali of those who believe) (Al-Baqarah: 257) and the Almighty said: (Your Wali is only Allah, His Messenger and those who believe) (Al-Ma'idah: 55). Allah has Awliya who take care of His affairs and establish His religion, and He (Allah) takes care of them (those Wali) with assistance, success, preservation and conciliation, and the balance for this guardianship is the Almighty's saying: (Indeed, the Awliya of Allah have no fear, nor do they grieve) (Yunus: 62).[59]

So, Wali (Pl. Awliya) in this context (Q.5: 55) means he or those who take care of Allah's affairs over mankind and establish His religion. Therefore, wali is guardian, a person or persons legally responsible to be in charge and protect Allah's religion and believers' affairs.

WHO ARE THESE AWLIYYAH?

The Sunni Imam Sa'du-Deen Al-Taftaazaniy (d. 793H) writes:

إشارة إلى الدليل النقلي من الكتاب و تقريره أن قوله تعالى: (إِنَّما
وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَ رَسُولُهُ وَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلاةَ وَ يُؤْتُونَ
الزَّكاةَ وَ هُمْ راكِعُونَ) نزلت باتفاق المفسرين في علي بن أبي طالب

---

[59] Muhammad Salih al-Uthaymeen, Majmu' fataawa, vol. 9 pg. 639.

http://islamport.com/w/ftw/Web/3460/2666.htm

(رضي الله عنه) حين أعطى السائل خاتمه و هو راكع في صلاته.
و كلمة «إنما» للحصر بشهادة النقل و الاستعمال

A reference to the textual evidence from the Qur'an and its report that the Almighty says: [Your guardian is only God and His Messenger and those who believe, those who establish prayer and give zakat while they are bowing]. It (the verse) was revealed, with the CONSENSUS of the Mufasireen (Quran commentators), on Ali bin Abi Talib (may God be pleased with him) when he gave the beggar his ring while in the state of ruku' (bowing) in his prayer. And the word "only (إنما)" refers to **RESTRICTION** with testimony of the transmission and the purpose.[60]

So, Allah, His Messenger and Ali ibn Abi Talib are Wali over the believers.

Imam al-Tirmidhi also documents an authentic hadith in this regard:

That Allah's Messenger put Ali ibn Abi Talib in charge of a military detachment to Syria..., and some companion complaint about Ali's decision to the noble Prophet whereby the blessed Prophet, peace and blessing be upon him and his progeny, said:

مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ
عَلِيٍّ إِنَّ عَلِيًّا مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْهُ وَهُوَ وَلِيُّ كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ مِنْ بَعْدِي

What do you want from 'Ali?! What do you want from 'Ali?! What do you want from 'Ali?! Indeed 'Ali is from me, and I am from him, and he is the Wali of every believer after me.[61]

---

[60] Sharh al-Maqaasid ('Alam al-Kutub, Beirut: 2nd Edition, 1419 H) [annotated by Salih Musa Sharaf], vol. 5, pg. 270

[61] Jami' Al-Tirmidhi: Sunnah.com reference: Book 49, Hadith 108; English translation : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3712; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4077; https://sunnah.com/tirmidhi/49/108

In summary, to believe, affirm and accept the Guardianship of Allah, His Messenger and Ali ibn Abi Talib after the demise of the Prophet is what is termed "al-Wilayah." And according to Shi'ah belief as read in the hadith (previously), it is the most important issue in the "Pillars of Islam" because it (Al-Wilayah) safeguards the other pillars.

IMAMAH OR KHILAFAH

Second, the official position of al-Wilayah is al-Imamah or al-Khilafah. Here, the command and direction of affairs, duties and functions left by the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) are taken over by the Khalīfah.

The noble Prophet talks about his Khalifah thus:

Imam Ibn Abi 'Asim (d. 287 H) records:

ثنا أبو بكر، ثنا عمرو بن سعد أبو داود الحفري، عن شريك، عن الركين عن القاسم بن حسان، عن زيد بن ثابت قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: إني تارك فيكم الخليفتين من بعدي، كتاب الله وعترتي أهل بيتي وإنهما لن يتفرقا حتى يردا علي الحوض

Abu Bakr – 'Amr b. Sa'd Abu Dawud al-Hafri – Sharik – al-Rakin – al-Qasim b. Hisan – Zayd b. Thabit:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, **"I AM LEAVING BEHIND OVER YOU THE TWO KHALIFAHS** after me: the Book of Allah and my offspring, my Ahl al-Bayt. Both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-Font."[62]

Shaykh al-Albani declares: It is a sahih (authentic) hadith

---

[62] Abu Bakr b. Abi 'Asim, Ahmad b. 'Amr b. al-Dhahhak b. Mukhlid al-Shaybani, Kitab al-Sunnah (al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400 H) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, pp. 350-351, # 754

This hadith puts everything in its perspective. The Khilafah vis-a-vis Khalīfah is seeded to the Prophet's bloodline, his Ahl al-Bayt. Without Imamah, all the establishment of the Prophets will either lost or corrupted by imposters. This is the reason the Prophet warned in a similar hadith:

حَدَّثَنَا نَصْرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ الْكُوفِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا زَيْدُ بْنُ الْحَسَنِ، هُوَ الأَنْمَاطِيُّ عَنْ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ جَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ رَأَيْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فِي حَجَّتِهِ يَوْمَ عَرَفَةَ وَهُوَ عَلَى نَاقَتِهِ الْقَصْوَاءِ يَخْطُبُ فَسَمِعْتُهُ يَقُولُ : يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي قَدْ تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ أَخَذْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا كِتَابَ اللَّهِ وَعِتْرَتِي أَهْلَ بَيْتِي

Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:

I saw the Messenger of Allah during his Hajj, on the Day of 'Arafah. He was upon his camel Qaswa, giving a Khutbah, so he said: 'O people! Indeed, I have left among you, that which if you hold fast to it, you shall not go astray: The Book of Allah and my offspring, my ahl al-Bayt.[63]

Grade: Sahih (authentic)

---

[63] Jami' Al-Tirmidhi: Sunnah.com reference: English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3786; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4155; https://sunnah.com/urn/636690

HIGHER STATUS OF IMAMAH

The other point of the Professor is that the Shi'ah "...reached to the extent of saying that it [Imamah] is even more than prophet hood in importance." Technically, without Prophethood/Messengerhood, there cannot be Imamah since the latter is the continuity of the functions of the former. However, we read in Sunni authentic ahadith (which the Prof. claimed to believe in) that there are some positions higher in rank than the status of Prophet-hood (nubuwah). However, a Prophet can also occupy such position alongside his Prophet-hood. One of such high-ranking positions is explained in this hadith:

Imam Abi Dawud documents:

حَدَّثَنَا زُهَيْرُ بْنُ حَرْبٍ، وَعُثْمَانُ بْنُ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ، قَالاَ حَدَّثَنَا جَرِيرٌ، عَنْ عُمَارَةَ بْنِ الْقَعْقَاعِ، عَنْ أَبِي زُرْعَةَ بْنِ عَمْرِو بْنِ جَرِيرٍ، أَنَّ عُمَرَ بْنَ الْخَطَّابِ، قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم إِنَّ مِنْ عِبَادِ اللَّهِ لأُنَاسًا مَا هُمْ بِأَنْبِيَاءَ وَلاَ شُهَدَاءَ يَغْبِطُهُمُ الأَنْبِيَاءُ وَالشُّهَدَاءُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ بِمَكَانِهِمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى . قَالُوا يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ تُخْبِرُنَا مَنْ هُمْ . قَالَ هُمْ قَوْمٌ تَحَابُّوا بِرُوحِ اللَّهِ عَلَى غَيْرِ أَرْحَامٍ بَيْنَهُمْ وَلاَ أَمْوَالٍ يَتَعَاطَوْنَهَا فَوَاللَّهِ إِنَّ وُجُوهَهُمْ لَنُورٌ وَإِنَّهُمْ عَلَى نُورٍ لاَ يَخَافُونَ إِذَا خَافَ النَّاسُ وَلاَ يَحْزَنُونَ إِذَا حَزِنَ النَّاسُ . وَقَرَأَ هَذِهِ الآيَةَ { أَلاَ إِنَّ أَوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ لاَ خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلاَ هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ }

Narrated Umar ibn al-Khattab: reported the Prophet (peace be upon him) as saying: There are people from the servants of Allah who are neither prophets nor martyrs; the prophets and martyrs **WILL ENVY THEM** on the Day of Resurrection **FOR THEIR RANK** from Allah, the Most High.

They (the people) asked: Tell us, Messenger of Allah, who are they? He replied: They are people who love one

another for the spirit of Allah, without having any mutual kinship and giving property to one. I swear by Allah, their faces will glow and they will be (sitting) in (pulpits of) light. They will have no fear (on the Day) when the people will have fear, and they will not grieve when the people will grieve. He then recited the following Qur'anic verse: "Behold! Verily for the friends of Allah there is no fear, nor shall they grieve.[64]

Grade: Sahih (Al-Albani)

In another narration, the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) is reported to have said: ''They are the awliya of Allah the Almighty, those upon whom no fear shall come, nor shall they grieve."[65]

Another lofty position is Imamah. Ibn Sirrin (d. 110 H), a senior Tabi'i of the Ahlu Sunnah gave account of the status of Imam al-Mahdi, the last Imam and Khalifah from the progeny of the Prophet, thus as recorded by Imam al-Maruzi:

حدثنا ضمرة عن ابن شوذب عن محمد بن سيرين أنه ذكر فتنة تكون فقال إذا كان ذلك فاجلسوا في بيوتكم حتى تسمعوا على الناس بخير من أبي بكر وعمر رضي الله عنهما قيل يا أبا بكر خير من أبي بكر وعمر؟ قال قد كان يفضل على بعض الأنبياء

Damrah – Ibn Shawdhab: "Muhammad Ibn Sirrin mentioned a sedition that would occur. Then he (Ibn Sirrin) said, 'When that occurs, sit in your houses until you hear from the people about the one who is superior to Abu Bakr and 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with them both.'

---

[64] Sunan Abi Dawud 3527In-book reference: Book 24, Hadith 112; English translation: Book 23, Hadith 3520; https://sunnah.com/abudawud/24/112

[65] Al-Hakim Al-Naysaburi, Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihayn, vol. 4, p. 188, #7318.

So, it was said, "O Abu Bakr, someone superior to Abu Bakr and Umar?!" He replied, "He is even superior to some Prophets."[66]

The case of Prophet Ibrahim (peace be upon him) explained the lofty position of Imamah better. Prophet Ibrahim (peace be upon him) was already a Prophet, a Messenger and Allah's chosen friend (awliyah); yet, he was elevated to the position of Imam[67] which he also requested for the righteous amongst his dhuriyyah [offspring].

REPLY TO THE MAIN QUESTIONS

Our professor asked, **"why is this great pillar of Religion not mentioned in the Qur'an just like the other pillars?"**

First, al-Wilayah vis-à-vis al-Imamah [divine leadership] with its main function is mentioned in different context of the holy Quran just like other pillars. For example:

FIRST VERSE:

Surah Al-Maeda, Verse 55:

إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ

Only Allah is your Wali and His Apostle and those who believe, those who keep up prayers and pay the poor-rate while they bow."

This verse has been explained at the beginning of this chapter. Furthermore, Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir in his Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem also document several chains for the above verse in connection to it's sabab nuzul (reason of revelation) part of which are stated below:

---

[66] Abū 'Abd Allāh Na'īm b. Ḥammād al-Marūzī, *Kitāb al-Fitan* (Dār al-Fikr; 1414 H) [annotator: Prof. Dr. Suhayl Zakār], part 5, p. 221

[67] Abū 'Abd Allāh Na'īm b. Ḥammād al-Marūzī, *Kitāb al-Fitan* (Dār al-Fikr; 1414 H) [annotator: Prof. Dr. Suhayl Zakār], part 5, p. 221

وقال ابن جرير : حدثني الحارث ، حدثنا عبد العزيز ، حدثنا غالب بن عبيد الله سمعت مجاهدا يقول في قوله : (إنما وليكم الله ورسوله) الآية : نزلت في علي بن أبي طالب تصدق وهو راكع

And Ibn Jarir said: al-Harith told me, Abd al-Aziz told us, Ghalib ibn Ubaydullah told us who heard from Mujahid who said, in his saying [Only Allah is your Wali and His Apostle], the verse: It was revealed for Ali ibn Abi Talib while he was in ruku.

وقال عبد الرزاق : حدثنا عبد الوهاب بن مجاهد عن أبيه ، عن ابن عباس في قوله (إنما وليكم الله ورسوله) الآية : نزلت في علي بن أبي طالب

Abd al-Razzaq said: Narrated to us, Abd al-Wahab ibn Mujahid, from his father, from ibn Abbas, his saying [Only Allah is your Wali and His Apostle...] was revealed over Ali ibn Abi Talib.[68]

It is to be noted that in another riwayat documented by Ibn Kathir and host of others (like Ibn Jarir Tabari, Qur'tubi, Suyuti and others in their respective tafasir), it was narrated that a needy entered into Prophet's Mosque and sought for help. No one responded. However, Ali ibn Abi Talib while in a state of ruku (genuflection) stretched his finger to the needy who removed his ring. It was on this gesture that Allah, the Wise, revealed the ayah. In short, what the ayah is saying is that Allah, His Apostle and Ali ibn Abi Talib are the Wali (pl. Awliyah) of all believers.

---

[68] Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem*, [Beirut Edition, Dar al-Marifat, 1412H) (sura *al-maida: 3*), vol. 2, p. 15

Wali is another derivative of Mawla, meaning someone with higher authority over others as Allah states:

... النَّبِيُّ أَوْلَى بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ أَنفُسِهِمْ

"The Prophet has awla – a greater claim – on the faithfuls than they have on themselves..."

[Surah Al-Ahzab, Verse 6]

Awla is the derivative of Mawla and Wali, all of them from the same root of [wa-la-ya]. We have already explained extensively the meaning with respect to its context. Likewise, it means someone with greater authority over the believers in the abovementioned verse.

SECOND VERSE:

Surah Ar-Rad, Verse 7 reads:

إِنَّمَا أَنتَ مُنذِرٌ وَلِكُلِّ قَوْمٍ هَادٍ

"... You are only a warner and (there is) a guide for every people."

Imam Jarir al-Tabari (d. 310 H) documented a sahih (authentic) Hadith to the Tafsir of the ayah where the prophet says:

أنا المنذر (ولكل قوم هاد) ، وأومأ بيده إلى منكب علي ،فقال : أنت الهادي يا علي ، بك يهتدي المهتدون بعدي

"I am a warner [and (there is) a guide for every people]", and he (the Prophet) held Ali by his shoulder, then said, "You are the guide O 'Ali, and it is through you that people will be guided after me."[69]

---

[69] Muhammad ibn Jarir Tabari, *Jami' al-bayan an tawil ay al-Quran*, under surah ar-Rad, verse 7

Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani acknowledged the authenticity of this hadith in his book, Fath al-Bāri.[70]

THIRD VERSE:

Surah An-Nisa, Verse 59 reads:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنكُمْ فَإِن تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِن كُنتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ ذَٰلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا

O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Apostle and those in authority from among you; then if you quarrel about anything, refer it to Allah and the Apostle, if you believe in Allah and the last day; this is better and very good in the end."

Who are "those in authority from among you"?

- Prophet says to the believers: "Do you not testify that Allāh is your Lord?" They said, "Yes, we do." He said, "Do you not testify that Allāh and His Messenger are more entitled to you than yourselves and that Allāh and His Messenger are your Awliyā?" They said, "Yes, we do". He said, "So, whosoever Allāh and His Messenger are his Mawlā, verily this one (i.e. 'Alī) is his mawlā. I have left behind over you that which if you hold fast to it you will never go astray: the Book of Allāh – one end of which is in His Hand and the other in your hands – and my Ahl al-Bayt." [Details in chapter one under meaning of Mawla]
- Allamah al-Albani in his annotated version of Ibn Asim's 'Kitab al-Sunnah documents:

---

[70] Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani, Fath al- Bāri (Riyadh: Printed at the expense of Prince Sultan bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud; 1st edition, 1421) [annotator: 'Abd al-Qādir Shaybah Al-Ahmad] vol. 8, pg. 376.

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to 'Ali:

ثنا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْمُثَنَّى ، حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ حَمَّادٍ ، عَنْ أَبِي عَوَانَةَ ، عَنْ يَحْيَى بْنِ سُلَيْمٍ أَبِي بَلْجٍ ، عَنْ عَمْرِو بْنِ مَيْمُونٍ ، عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ ، قَالَ : قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لِعَلِيٍّ : أَنْتَ مِنِّي بِمَنْزِلَةِ هَارُونَ مِنْ مُوسَى ، إِلا أَنَّكَ لَسْتَ نَبِيًّا ، إِنَّهُ لا يَنْبَغِي أَنْ أَذْهَبَ إِلا وَأَنْتَ خَلِيفَتِي فِي كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ مِنْ بَعْدِي

"You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet. [Verily, it is not right that I depart except] with you as my Khalifah (successor) over every believer after me."[71]

Imam Tirmidhi documents an interesting story where Ali was made the commander in charge of an expedition to Yemen. Four (4) of his soldiers did not like or accept his decision thereby took the case to the Prophet. Prophet said to them:

مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ إِنَّ عَلِيًّا مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْهُ وَهُوَ وَلِيُّ كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ بَعْدِي

What do you want from 'Ali?! What do you want from 'Ali?! Indeed 'Ali is from me, and I am from him, and he is the WALI of every believer after me.[72]

Some Sunni scholars try to be smart saying "wali" simply means "friend." By Allah! Is that context not clear enough? If "wali" in the above context means "friend", why would Prophet say, "... and he is your friend after me"? Does that make any sense?

---

[71] Source: Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400H) [annotator: Nasir al-Din al-Albani], vol. 2, p. 565, #1188

[72] Sahih Sunan Tirmidhi, Book on virtues; English reference : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3712; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4077; https://sunnah.com/urn/635910

Alas! The same "wali" was used for Abu Bakr and Umar, and Sunni understood it to mean "successor."

• In a long hadith, Imam Muslim documents:

قَالَ فَلَمَّا تُوُفِّيَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ أَنَا وَلِيُّ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم....

He (Umar) said: When the Messenger of Allah passed away, Abu Bakr said:" I am the wali (successor) of the Messenger of Allah....so both of you (Ali and Abbas) thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest...

ثُمَّ تُوُفِّيَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ وَأَنَا وَلِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَ وَلِي أَبِي بَكْرٍ

When Abu Bakr passed away and (I have become) the wali (successor) of the Messenger of Allah and wali (successor) of Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him), so both of you (Ali and Abbas) thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest..."[73]

Putting all these verses together alongside Prophetic interpretations, one could see that Ali ibn Abi Taalib was introduced by the Prophet using different precise titles of the same meaning to leave us with no excuse. Ali was introduced by the Prophet as "Mawla, Wali, Hadi (guide) and Khalifah (successor)" after him. Yet, people continue to play pranks with the command of the Prophet and have audacity castigating the Shi'a for following the noble Prophet's command.

Lastly, In Majmuh Fataawa (of Sheikh Ibn Uthaymeen) we read:

---

[73] Sahih Muslim 1757 c; In-book reference : Book 32, Hadith 58; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 19, Hadith 4349; https://sunnah.com/muslim/32/58

- [507] The noble Sheik was asked: about the saying of man if he addressed a king: ((Ya Mawlaya - Oh My Mawla))?

He (the Sheik) replied: Al-Wilayat is divided into two parts: First division: Wilayat Mutlaq (absolute Wilayat) and this is only for Allah Almighty is like absolute sovereignty, and Allah's Wilayat in the general sense is universal to everyone. Allah Most High says:

ثُمَّ رُدُّوا إِلَى اللَّهِ مَوْلَاهُمُ الْحَقِّ أَلَا لَهُ الْحُكْمُ وَهُوَ أَسْرَعُ الْحَاسِبِينَ

Then are they sent back to Allah, their Mawla, the True one; now surely His is the judgment and He is swiftest in taking account.} (al-An'am: 62). This made Him the Mawla of these dishonorable people, and this Wilayat is general. But in the sense of a particular meaning, then it is particular to the righteous believers. Allah Most High says:

ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّ اللَّهَ مَوْلَى الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَأَنَّ الْكَافِرِينَ لَا مَوْلَىٰ لَهُمْ

That is because Allah is the Mawla of those who believe, and because the unbelievers shall have no protector for them. (Muhammad: 11) ... This is a particularized and special Wilayat.

Second division:

Restricted or Limited Wilayat. And this is (used) for other than Allah. And for it, there are several meaning. From it is:

An-Naasir (The helper), and al-Mutawala Lil Umuur (The One in charge of affairs), and as-Sayyid (The Master).

(Pertaining the first meaning - An-Naasir), Allah Most High says:

... وَإِن تَظَاهَرَا عَلَيْهِ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ مَوْلَاهُ وَجِبْرِيلُ وَصَالِحُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

and if you back up each other against him, then surely Allah it is Who is his Mawla (Helper), and Jibreel and - the righteous believers...(Tahrim: 4)

(Pertaining the second meaning - al-Mutawala Lil Umuur), He (the Prophet), peace be upon him, says: من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه Whosoever I am his Mawla, then Ali is his mawla}

(Pertaining the second meaning - as-Sayyid), he - peace be upon him says:

إنما الولاء لمن اعتق "The Wala' is for the manumitted (of the slave)."

And on this, it is alright to say to the king: "my Mawla" in the sense of my master, unless he is afraid of it, he is not allowed to do so. [74]

The above submission is a precise and explicit explanation of various meaning of Mawla (or it's other derivatives like Awla, Wali) and it is in the right perspective that even the respected Salafi sheik, ibn Saalih al-Uthaymeen also ''shares'' Shia interpretation that Mawla in the hadith of the Prophet, "for whoever I am his Mawla, then Ali is his Mawla" is in the meaning of al-Mutawala Lil Umuur – The one in charge of Affairs.

A nail on the coffin is the verse of obedience to Allah, His Messenger and Ulil Amr [nisa: 59] with regards to yet another authentic hadith of the noble Prophet.

Imam Hakim al-Naysaburi (d. 405 H) documents:

أخبرنا أبو أحمد محمد بن محمد الشيباني من أصل كتابه ، ثنا علي بن سعيد بن بشير الرازي ، بمصر، ثنا الحسن بن حماد الحضرمي ، ثنا يحيى بن يعلى ، ثنا بسام الصيرفي ، عن الحسن بن عمرو الفقيمي، عن معاوية بن ثعلبة ، عن أبي ذر - رضي الله عنه - قال : قال رسول الله

---

[74] *Majmuh Fataawa* wa Rasaail fadhilat ash-Sheik Muhammad ibn Saalih al-Uthaymeen, vol. 3 page 136 – 137

- صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم -: من أطاعني فقد أطاع الله ، ومن عصاني فقد عصى الله ، ومن أطاع عليا فقد أطاعني ، ومن عصى عليا فقد عصاني

هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد ، ولم يخرجاه

Abu Ahmad Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Shaibani told us, from the origin of his book, from Ali bin Saeed bin Bashir al-Razi, in Egypt, from al-Hassan bin Hammad al-Hadrami, from Yahya bin Yala, from Bassam al-Sirafi, from al-Hasan bin Amr al-Faqimi, from Muawiyah bin Tha`labah, from Abi Dhar - May God be pleased with him - he said:

The Messenger of Allah - may Allah's prayers and peace be upon him and his family - said: "Whoever obeys me has obeyed Allah, and whoever disobeys me has disobeyed Allah, and whoever obeys Ali has obeyed me, and whoever disobeys Ali has disobeyed me." [75]

Imam Hakim: The chain of this hadith is authentic

Imam al-Dhahabi: Sahih (authentic)

Finally, the Prof. also adds:

Why is it that a verse wasn't revealed to declare the leadership of Aliyu, this is evident because there is no verse that shows Aliyu to be the first leader of Muslim Community after the demise of the prophet.

All the cited verses alongside various corroborating authentic ahadith are enough to convince truth-seekers.

---

[75] al-Hakim al-Naysabouri, *al-Mustadrak 'ala as-Sahihayn*, (Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah) [annotator: Mustafa Abd al-Qadir 'Ata] kitab Ma'rifat as-Sahabah, vol. 3, pg. 131; Hadith 4617 (215)

Unfortunately, the Prof made his real intention known when he says:

Why is the name of Aliyu not mentioned in the Qur'an but the name of Zaidu is very clear in Suratul Ahzab? It's a known fact that Shi'ite scholars had a consensus that Aliyu's name is provided in hundreds of Qur'anic verses but the companions removed it. This is clear in their holy book; Alkafi.

How does it matter that Ali's name must appear when the Quranic verses were interpreted and explained by the noble Prophet himself? Quran gives specifics about divine leadership over all the believers and the Prophet introduced Ali as that Khalifah, Wali, Hadi and Mawla after him. What difference will it make that "Ali's name" should have appear in the Quran rather than Prophet explaining it? Did Allah not order us to follow, obey and take our matters back to Him and the Prophet [an-Nisa: 59]?

Besides, salat for example was mentioned in the Quran but only in specific terms. The details as per names of each salats, how many times in a day, how many rakat per salat, how to perform them etc were explained in details by the Prophet. Why can't the antagonists complain too that Quran should have mentioned the details of salat rather than the Prophet explaining it? The noble Prophet was the talking Quran. The case of Zaid that was mentioned in the Quran has nothing to do with Khilafah or make him superior to Abu Bakar, Umar Uthman, and Ali in Sunni view. So, what's the hollabaloo about his name being mentioned? Even Iblis, Pharaoh etc were mentioned by name in the Quran. Does that give them any good credentials? And there were excellent servants of Allah (like Khidr, Dhul-Qurnain etc) not mentioned by (their real) name in the Quran; were their status reduced as a result of that?

Lastly, if Shi'a claim that Ali's name is "mentioned" in the holy Qur'an, it is by the meaning of how the sahabah used to read those verses to remind themselves of the Prophet's interpretation, and not that the name is actually part of the text of the Quran. In the first chapter of this book, we have

quoted Imam al-Suyuti who has documented the recitation of Abdullah ibn Mas'ud, one of the best Quran reciters and interpreters amongst the sahabah. Here it is again:

- Reported ibn Mardawi, From Ibn Mas'ud who said: We used to read during the lifetime of messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) O Apostle! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord that Ali is MAWLA of all the believers and if you do not, then you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people."

So, majority of the Sahabah used to recite the verse with slight variations [a kind of interpretative recitations] whereas the main text of the revelation is:

- Apostle! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord and if you do not, then you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people."

Cases of variation in recitation is abundant. Only the students of ulum al-Quran (seciences of Quran) will fully understand it. And this does not suggest addition or substraction from the Quran. We have talked about that earlier and we shall talk more on it at an appropriate chapter in sha Allah.

CHAPTER SIX

IMAMAH IN THE QUR'AN AND HADITH (2)

Question 6:

On the day of the conquest of Makkah, the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, borrowed the key to the door of the Ka'bah from the tribe of Banu Talhah, who are the custodians of the keys; this was an inherited custom from time immemorial.

When the Prophet conquered Makkah, he requested the key to open the door of the Ka'bah. This was a very tragic event for Banu Talhah, as it marked the end of their custody of the key, which led them to cry. Immediately, a verse was revealed regarding this issue, where Allah says:

"Allah doth command you to render back your trusts to those to whom they are due; and when ye judge between people, that ye judge with justice: verily how excellent is the teaching which He giveth you! For Allah is He who heareth and seeth all things."

In response to the above verse, the Noble Prophet returned the keys to Banu Talhah. He further made a pronouncement that reaffirmed their custody of the key until the Day of Resurrection and said:

"Take the keys, O Banu Talhah; they will stay with you forever, and no one will take them away from you except a tyrant."

Our question here is: If an issue as simple as the keys to the Ka'bah was so direct and clear for establishing the trust of the custodians—and this trust is just for custody and not ownership—then why is there no bequest or pronouncement regarding the leadership of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, that you always claim? Why didn't the Prophet make such a pronouncement and say: "Take this leadership, O family of Ali, forever, and no one will take it away from you except a tyrant"? Why didn't the Prophet,

Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, do this? Is the concept of leadership not more important than anything else, as your insinuation asserts?

THE REPLY

First, question(s) 6 is a repetitive version of question 5 and justice has been done on it.

Second, our professor's questions here are in two-fold:

- Why is there no pronouncement by the Prophet regarding the leadership of Ali after him?
- Why didn't the Prophet make pronouncement as to the leadership of Ali's family?

The first question has been fully answered in our reply to question 5. Ali ibn Abi Talib was introduced by the Prophet on several occasions with different epithets like Mawla, Wali, Hadi and Khalifah over the believers after him.

On the other hand, Prophet introduced that there will be twelve khalifah after him till the day of judgement, and his ahl al-Bayt (of whom Ali was the first) were designated as those Khalifah.

HADITH ONE: Twelve Khalifah

- Imam Muslim documents:

Chapter: The people follow the Quraish and the Caliphate belongs to the Quraish باب النَّاسُ تَبَعٌ لِقُرَيْشٍ وَالْخِلاَفَةُ فِي قُرَيْشٍ

It has been narrated on the authority of Jabir b. Samura that the Prophet (s) said:

This order (Islam) will continue to be dominant until there have been twelve Caliphs. The narrator says: Then he said something which I could not understand, and I said to my

father: What did he say? My father told me that he said that all of them (Caliphs) would be from the Quraish.[76]

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو بَكْرِ بْنُ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ، حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو مُعَاوِيَةَ، عَنْ دَاوُدَ، عَنِ الشَّعْبِيِّ، عَنْ جَابِرِ، بْنِ سَمُرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم لاَ يَزَالُ هَذَا الأَمْرُ عَزِيزًا إِلَى اثْنَىْ عَشَرَ خَلِيفَةً . قَالَ ثُمَّ تَكَلَّمَ بِشَىْءٍ لَمْ أَفْهَمْهُ فَقُلْتُ لأَبِي مَا قَالَ فَقَالَ: كُلُّهُمْ مِنْ قُرَيْشٍ

- Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal also documents:

Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying, "There will be after me twelve Khalifah, all of them from Quraysh."[77]

Sheik al-Arnaut says: It is a Sahih hadith

Quraysh clan is too big a clan, and there were already enough rivalries between them especially between the Banu Umayyah and Banu Hashim. If the Prophet did not give details of these Khilafah, there would definitely be more chaos and fight.

HADITH TWO:

Khalifah are from ahl al-Bayt

- Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents:

(حديث مرفوع) حَدَّثَنَا الْأَسْوَدُ بْنُ عَامِرٍ ، حَدَّثَنَا شَرِيكٌ ، عَنِ الرُّكَيْنِ ، عَنِ الْقَاسِمِ بْنِ حَسَّانَ ، عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ ثَابِتٍ ، قَالَ : قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

---

[76] Sahih Muslim 1821 e; In-book reference : Book 33, Hadith 9; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 20, Hadith 4481; https://sunnah.com/muslim/33/9

[77] Musnad, vol. 5, p. 106, #hadith no. 21051; vol. 5, p. 92, #hadith no. 20890

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ : إِنِّي تَارِكٌ فِيكُمْ خَلِيفَتَيْنِ كِتَابُ اللَّهِ ، حَبْلٌ مَمْدُودٌ مَا بَيْنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالْأَرْضِ أَوْ مَا بَيْنَ السَّمَاءِ إِلَى الْأَرْضِ ، وَعِتْرَتِي أَهْلُ بَيْتِي ، وَإِنَّهُمَا لَنْ يَتَفَرَّقَا حَتَّى يَرِدَا عَلَيَّ الْحَوْضَ

"I am leaving behind over you two Khalifahs (successors): the Book of Allah – a rope stretching between the heaven and the earth – and my offspring, my Ahl al-Bayt. Verily, both shall never separate from each other until they meet me at the Lake-font"[78]

Allamah al-Albani comment: SAHIH

In other version, the word thaqalayn – two weighty things was used instead of khalifatain – two khalifahs. Both words were used in the same context to signify importance and to leave us with no excuse.[79] This hadith clearly signifies and designates the offspring, the ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet as Khalifah after him till the day of judgement.

HADITH THREE:

Prophet mentioned the first and the last of these khalifah

- Imam Ibn Abi Asim (d. 287H) documented in his Kitab al-Sunnah:

Muhammad b. al Muthanna - Yahya b. Hammad – Abu 'Awanah – Yahya b. Sulaym Abu Balj – 'Amr b. Maymun – Ibn Abbas:

---

[78] Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbali, Imam al-Fasawi (d. 277H) in his al-Ma'rifah wa al-Tarikh vol. 1, p. 291; Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah (d. 235H) in his Musnad Ibn Abī Shaybah (Riyādh: Dār al-Waṭan; 1st edition, 1418 H) [annotators: 'Ādil b. Yūsuf al-'Azāzī and Aḥmad b. Farīd al-Mazīdī], vol. 1, p. 108; and Allamah Nasir al-Din al-Albani in his Sahih al-Jami al-saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 1, p. 482, #2457

[79] Of course, the hadith of "book of Allah and my sunnah" is fabrication in line with Sunni ilm al-hadith scholarship. There is no single authentic chain for it.

ثنا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْمُثَنَّى ، حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ حَمَّادٍ ، عَنْ أَبِي عَوَانَةَ ، عَنْ يَحْيَى بْنِ سُلَيْمٍ أَبِي بَلْجٍ ، عَنْ عَمْرِو بْنِ مَيْمُونٍ ، عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ ، قَالَ : قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لِعَلِيٍّ : أَنْتَ مِنِّي بِمَنْزِلَةِ هَارُونَ مِنْ مُوسَى ، إِلا أَنَّكَ لَسْتَ نَبِيًّا وَأَنْتَ خَلِيفَتِي فِي كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ مِنْ بَعْدِي

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said to 'Ali: "You are to me of the status of Harun to Musa, with the exception that you are not a prophet. It is not befitting that I leave except that you are my Khalifah over every believer after me."[80]

- Concerning the last khalifah, Imam Abu Dawud documents:

Narrated Ali ibn AbuTalib: The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: If only one day of this time (world) remained, Allah would raise up a man from my ahl al-Bayt who would fill this earth with justice as it has been filled with oppression.[81]

Grade: Sahih (Al-Albani)

- Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) also records about al-Mahdi:

Abu 'Abd Allah al-Saffar – Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. Urumah – alḥusayn b. Hafs - Sufyan – Khalid al-Hadhā – Abu Qilābah – Abu Asma – Thawban, radiyallahu 'anhu:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, "Near your treasure, three people will kill one another. Each of them will be a son of a Khalifah. But it will not get to any of them. Then the black flags will come from the East, and they will fight you in a way that no nation had ever been fought." Then he mentioned something and he [the

---

[80] Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-sami'ili al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi) [annotator: Dr. Basim b. Faysal al-Jawabirah], vol. 1, p. 199-200, #1222}.

[81] Sunan Abi Dawud 4283; In-book reference : Book 38, Hadith 5; English translation : Book 37, Hadith 4270 https://www.sunnah.com/abudawud/38/5

Prophet] said: "When you see him, pledge allegiance to him, even if you have to crawl on snow, for verily he is the Khalifah of Allah, the Mahdi."[82]

Al-Hakim declares: This hadith is sahih upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.

And Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748 H) agrees: Upon the standard of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

After the demise of the Prophet, upon this clear instructions and order, what happened? The holy Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) advices Ali:

- Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852H) documents:

Al-Fadl, Abu Naim - Fitr b. Khalifah - Habib b. Abi Thabit - Thalabah b. Yazid:

I heard Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, saying: "I swear by Allah, verily, the Umm Prophet, peace be upon him, told me: "They (the Ummah) will soon betray you after me."[83]

- Imam al-Hakim (d. 403H) also documents:

Abu Hafs Umar b. Ahmad al-Jamhi - Ali b. Abd al-Aziz - Amr b. Awn - Hushaym - Ismail b. Salim - Abu Idris al-Awdi - Ali, may Allah be pleased with him:

---

[82] Abu 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 4, p. 510, # 8432

[83] Al-Matalib al-Aliyah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-Thamaniyyah (Riyadh: Dar al-Asimah; 1st edition, 1420H) [annotator: Abd Allah b. Zafir b. Abd Allah al-Shahri], vol. 16, p. 64, #3919

- "Verily, part of what the Prophet, peace be upon him, told me is that the Ummah would soon betray me after him."[84]

Then, Imam Hakim declares: This hadith has a sahih chain

And Imam al-Dhahabi (d. 748H) concurs: Sahih

FURTHER INVESTIGATION

The Ummah did not only betray Ali ibn Abi Talib but also waged war and rebelled against his government when he finally assumed authority after 23 years of the Prophet's demise. He was later murdered and his son al-Hasan ibn Ali became the Khalifah. Again, al-Hasan's government was rebelled against until he abdicated power. Al-Hasan was also killed by poison. At this stage, the ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet were like strangers. The head of the Prophet's ahl al-Bayt, al-Husein ibn Ali upon refusing to pleadge allegiance to those who hijacked the Ahl al-Bayt's right was brutally killed alongside 72 of his immediate family and companions. The rest of the Ahl al-Bayt were enslaved and later given house arrest.

It is a fact that Prophets and Messengers of Allah were appointed for the guidance of their community or beyond but some were rejected and even killed. Those who believe in their messages and took them as guide were on the right path. This was also the case with the Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon them all. Today, only the Shia Imamiyah follow twelve khalifah from the ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet; first of whom was Ali ibn Abi Talib and the last being the awaited Mahdi.

We hereby challenge the Professor and whoever shares his ideology to prove the legitimacy of the Khulafah they believed in. When they try to be smart, they will tell you Prophet said we should follow the khulafau ar-Rashidin (rightly guided caliphs) after him and if you should ask who were these Khulafau? Their programmed answer is:

---

[84] Hakim al-Naysapuri, Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411H) [annotator: Mustafa Abd al-Qadir Ata], vol. 3, p. 150, #4676; vol. 3, p. 153, #4686.

they were four – Abu bakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali. Question is where did the Prophet ever says they are four and even counted them as you have claimed? They will be dead silent. Here, we bring excerpts from the book The Axe of Ibrahim [page 29 – 32] to complete the puzzle:

The fact is that there is no single Prophetic narration to prove that these Khulafau we are instructed to follow after the Prophet were four and their names are as mentioned above. It's only a fabrication of Ahlu Sunnah deceitfully presented as Aqeedah (belief). Surprisingly, there is one fabricated hadith designed to support this belief and smart Ahlu Sunnah scholars always quote it to hoodwink the gullible. Imam al-Tirmidhi [in his Jami al-Tirmidhi Hadith 2226] documents the hadith:

Sa'eed bin Jumhan narrated:

"Safinah narrated to me, he said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: "Al-Khilafah will be in my Ummah for thirty years, then there will be monarchy after that." Then Safinah said to me: Count the Khilafah of Abu Bakr, then he said: Count the Khilafah of Umar and the Khilafah of Uthman. Then he said to me: Count the Khilafah of Ali." He said: "So we found that they add up to thirty years." Sa'eed said: "I said to him: Banu Umaiyyah claim that the Khilafah is among them. He said: Banu Az-Zarqa lie, rather they are a monarchy, among the worst of monarchies.

حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ مَنِيعٍ، حَدَّثَنَا سُرَيْجُ بْنُ النُّعْمَانِ، حَدَّثَنَا حَشْرَجُ بْنُ نُبَاتَةَ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُمْهَانَ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي سَفِينَةُ، قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلي الله عليه وسلم الْخِلاَفَةُ فِي أُمَّتِي ثَلاَثُونَ سَنَةً ثُمَّ مُلْكٌ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ ثُمَّ قَالَ لِي سَفِينَةُ أَمْسِكْ خِلاَفَةَ أَبِي بَكْرٍ وَخِلاَفَةَ عُمَرَ وَخِلاَفَةَ عُثْمَانَ ثُمَّ قَالَ لِي أَمْسِكْ خِلاَفَةَ عَلِيٍّ قَالَ فَوَجَدْنَاهَا ثَلاَثِينَ سَنَةً قَالَ سَعِيدٌ فَقُلْتُ لَهُ إِنَّ بَنِي أُمَيَّةَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّ الْخِلاَفَةَ فِيهِمْ قَالَ كَذَبُوا بَنُو الزَّرْقَاءِ بَلْ هُمْ مُلُوكٌ مِنْ شَرِّ الْمُلُوكِ قَالَ أَبُو عِيسَى وَفِي الْبَابِ عَنْ

عُمَرَ وَعَلِيٍّ قَالاَ لَمْ يَعْهَدِ النَّبِيُّ صلي الله عليه وسلم فِي الْخِلاَفَةِ شَيْئًا وَهَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ قَدْ رَوَاهُ غَيْرُ وَاحِدٍ عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُمْهَانَ وَلاَ نَعْرِفُهُ إِلاَّ مِنْ حَدِيثِ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُمْهَانَ

Grade: Hasan (Darussalam).

This narration is what Ahlu Sunnah relied upon to formulate the idea that Khulafau ar-Rashideen al-Mahdiyeen (rightly guided Caliphs) the Prophet talked about were only four and their names are as mentioned above.

REVEALING THE LIES

As beautifully mentioned by Sheikh Ibn Taofeeq in his book (Salafiyyah fil mizan), Ahlu Sunnah hadith scholars generally grade hadith as authentic based on its sanad (chain of transmission). If the chain is presumably okay, the body, the text and message of the hadith is automatically and dogmatically accepted.

This hadith that is ascribed to the Prophet [may my father, mother and my life be of sacrifice to him] that, "Al-Khilafah will be in my Ummah for thirty years, then there will be monarchy after that," is exposed by the following facts:

- Counting test

In this narration, Safinah and Saeed ibn Jumhan are believed to have counted the years of reign of the first four historical Caliphs to be thirty (30) years therefore, fulfilling the alleged Prophetic prophecy. But the question is how exactly did they count these years?

Imam Abu Dawud documents (same Safinah and Saeed ibn Jumhan) thus:

Narrated Safinah:

The Prophet (s) said: The Caliphate of Prophecy will last thirty years; then Allah will give the Kingdom of His Kingdom to anyone He wills.

Sa'id told that Safinah said to him: Calculate Abu Bakr's caliphate as two years, Umar's as ten, Uthman's as twelve and Ali so and so. Sa'id said: I said to Safinah: They conceive that Ali was not a caliph. He replied: The buttocks of Marwan told a lie.

حَدَّثَنَا سَوَّارُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الْوَارِثِ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُمْهَانَ، عَنْ سَفِينَةَ، قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلي الله عليه وسلم خِلاَفَةُ النُّبُوَّةِ ثَلاَثُونَ سَنَةً ثُمَّ يُؤْتِي اللَّهُ الْمُلْكَ أَوْ مُلْكَهُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ قَالَ سَعِيدٌ قَالَ لِي سَفِينَةُ أَمْسِكْ عَلَيْكَ أَبَا بَكْرٍ سَنَتَيْنِ وَعُمَرَ عَشْرًا وَعُثْمَانَ اثْنَتَىْ عَشْرَةَ وَعَلِيٌّ كَذَا قَالَ سَعِيدٌ قُلْتُ لِسَفِينَةَ إِنَّ هَؤُلاَءِ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّ عَلِيًّا عَلَيْهِ السَّلاَمُ لَمْ يَكُنْ بِخَلِيفَةٍ قَالَ كَذَبَتْ أَسْتَاهُ بَنِي الزَّرْقَاءِ يَعْنِي بَنِي مَرْوَانَ

Grade: Hasan Sahih (Al-Albani) [Ref: Sunan Abi Dawud, Hadith 4646]

So, the combined reign of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman were 24 years and that of Ali was "so and so". If the fabricated hadith says "Caliphate in my Ummah will be for 30 years", and Abubakar, Umar and Uthman spent 24 years, then Ali [who is believed to be the fourth (4th) Ahlu Sunnah's fabricated four rightly guided Caliph] would have spend six (6) years to complete the alleged Prophecy. Unfortunately, history is not kind with fabricators and liars. Ali never spent 6 years in power; hence, the need for this narration to be doctored as "...And Ali, so and so".

Ali ibn Abi Taalib only spent 4 years and few months which will bring the total of reign of these four Caliphs to 28 years and few months. What a prophecy!

- Hasan ibn Ali's Test

Al-Haafiz ibn Kathir in his al-Bidayat wa al-Nihayah opined that the duration of Hasan ibn Ali's assumption to power to the time he abdicated the seat to a more power thirsty Mu'aawiyah completed the thirty years and the fact that the latter declared himself as King fulfilled the Prophecy.

This view has only compounded Ahlu Sunnah's ideological problem. Counting Hasan ibn Ali to their four Caliphs in order to complete the 30 years prophecy will naturally increase the number of Ahlu Sunnah's rightly guided Caliphs to five (5) as against their ideological four (4). Besides, who will dare not count Hasan ibn Ali as part of Khalifat an-Nabawiyah?! Yet, some refused to count him with a weird excuse that he did not die in power. Things are getting messier, aren't they?

- The acid test: Twelve (12) Caliphs of the Prophet for the Ummah

Imam al-Tirmidhi [Al-Jami al-Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi hadith 2223] document:

Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying, there will be after me twelve Amirs. Then he said something which I did not hear clearly. So I asked the one next to me, and he said, "All of them will be from Quraysh.

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلي الله عليه وسلم: يَكُونُ مِنْ بَعْدِي اثْنَا عَشَرَ أَمِيرًا . قَالَ ثُمَّ تَكَلَّمَ بِشَيْءٍ لَمْ أَفْهَمْهُ فَسَأَلْتُ الَّذِي يَلِينِي فَقَالَ قَالَ: كُلُّهُمْ مِنْ قُرَيْشٍ . قَالَ أَبُو عِيسَى هَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ صَحِيحٌ

Albani: Sahih

Imam Ahmad [Musnad (annotator: Shuaib al-Arnaut), vol. 5, p. 99, #20978] records:

Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) - my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) - Mumal b. Ismail - Hamad b. Salmah - Dawud b. Hind - al-Shu'bi - Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Prophet, peace be upon him, saying: " There will be for this Ummah twelve Khalifah".

Sheik al-Arnaut says: It is a Sahih hadith

Again Imam Ahmad [Musnad (annotator: Shuaib al-Arnaut), vol. 5, p.106, #21051] reads:

Jabir b. Samurah:

I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, saying, "There will be after me twelve Khalifah, all of them from Quraysh."

Obviously, it is possible that the Prophet repeated this hadith severally at various places with different wordings to make emphasis; hence, changes in its text variation. And this hadith killed the alleged 30 years Caliphacy.

Therefore, having established their numbers to be 12 and their reigns to be long till the end of time (starting from Prophet's demise), we can safely and sagely conclude that the hadith of Khulafau a- Rashideen al-Mahdiyeen is only telling us the standard and qualities for the recognition of true Khulafau after the Prophet's demise, the fact that there would be and indeed there were imposters, monsters and criminals that posed as Prophet's Khulafah after him.[85]

[85] Abdulwasi Olawale A., ***The Axe of Ibrahim*** (2019), page 29 – 32

CHAPTER SEVEN

WHY WAS HAZRAT FATIMAH NOT AMONGST THE IMAMS?

Question 7:

You always claim that your twelve leaders are infallible. If you are asked to provide proof or authority, you would say that the reason for their leadership, as well as their infallibility, lies in the fact that the Noble Prophet clothed Ali, Fatima, Hassan, and Hussain and said: "Oh Allah! These are my household; then remove all abomination from them and make them pure and spotless."

However, since Allah Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala purifies them, they are regarded as infallibles (ma'sum).

Our question here is: Why didn't you call Fatima (ma'sumah)? We do not see her name among your leaders, even though that Prophetic tradition is the evidence of leadership in your doctrine! Furthermore, where are the remaining nine leaders in that verse or in the Prophetic tradition?

REPLY

All praise be to Allah! The Professor somehow agreed with the Shi'a that the twelve leaders are infallible. In his words, "since Allah subhanahu wa ta'ala purifies them then they are regarded as infallibles (ma'asum)."

Since there is agreement here on the infallibility of the ahl al-Bayt, there is no point flogging the issue again. Therefore, we are left with these two questions:

- Our question here is, why didn't you call Fatima as (ma'asumah), we didn't see her name among your leaders because that Prophetic tradition is the evidence of leadership in your doctrine!! Further

more, where are the remaining nine leaders in that verse or the Prophetic tradition?

First, Hazrat Fatimah (peace be upon her) is known as masoomah (infallible) as a result of the fact that she was part of ahl al-kisa (people of the cloak) whom Allah purified as also agreed upon by the Professor.

- Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279H) documents on "Book of virtues – Kitab al-Manaqib":

Narrated 'Umar bin Abi Salamah - the step-son of the Prophet (peace be upon him)

"When these Ayat were revealed to the Prophet, "Allah only wishes to remove the Rijs from you, O members of the family, and to purify you with a thorough purification...' (33:33) in the home of Umm Salamah, he called for Fatimah, Hasan, Husain, and wrapped him in the cloak while 'Ali was behind him, then he said: 'O Allah! These are my Ahl al-bayt, so remove the Rijs from them, and purify them with a thorough purification.' Umm Salamah said: Am I with them, O Prophet of Allah? He replied, "You are upon your place and you are upon a good thing."[86]

Second, the assumption-question of our professor [that since Fatimah was also infallible, why didn't we see her name as part of the Imams] is very wrong. The verse of purification and prophetic ahadith on it only signify the ahl al-Bayt's infallibility and not leadership.

Third, woman cannot be designated as Imam. Hazrat Maryam (peace be upon her) was al-Muqaddasa (the saint, the holy) according to the Quran. She was also visited by the angel(s) and received wahy (divine inspiration) and fed with heavenly foods; yet, she was not appointed as leader (Imam) despite having status above (even) some Prophets.

---

[86] *Jami' at*-Tirmidhi, English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3787; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4156 www.sunnah.com/urn/736700

Lastly, how do we prove the rest of our nine (9) Imams to be infallible since only five (5) individuals were mentioned in the hadith including the Prophet himself? This is the last question of our professor.

- We have established the divine leadership after the Prophet to be twelve (12) khalifa from the ahl al-Bayt and that their reign will be till the end of the world.
- Generally, Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) did confirm their infallibility. Imam al-Tirmidhi documents a hadith which gives another explicit factor of infallibility:

Narrated Zaid bin Arqam:

that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: "Indeed, I am leaving among you, that which if you hold fast to them, you shall never be misguided after me. ....The Book of Allah...and my offspring - Ahl al-bayt - and they (the book of Allah and the Ahl al-bayt) will NEVER separate until they meet (me) at the Hawd..."[87]

عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ أَرْقَمَ، رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا قَالاَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ...
صلى الله عليه وسلم إِنِّي تَارِكٌ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ تَمَسَّكْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ
تَضِلُّوا بَعْدِي ... كِتَابُ اللَّهِ ... وَعِتْرَتِي أَهْلُ بَيْتِي وَلَنْ يَتَفَرَّقَا
... حَتَّى يَرِدَا عَلَيَّ الْحَوْضَ

Grade: Sahih (Darussalam)

The implication of this hadith is that the Imams of the Ahl al-bayt in general can NEVER separate from the Holy Quran. Meaning that their actions are in line with the Quran at all time. Should the Ahl al-bayt commit a mistake or sin, it is an obvious deviation from the book of Allah. Those four members presented by the Prophet under the

---

[87] Jami' al-Tirmidhi, English reference : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3788; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4157; https://sunnah.com/urn/636710

cloak were only alive at the time to enjoy such declaration while the rest to come were generally presented in the abovementioned hadith. We have once quoted a hadith where Prophet says, "al-Mahdi is from us, the ahl al-Bayt,"[88] "The Mahdi will be of my offspring, of the descendants of Fatimah"[89] despite the fact that he is to come at a distant future.

CHAPTER EIGHT

ISLAM OF THOSE WHO WERE NOT AWARE OF ALI'S IMAMAH

Question 8:

During the life of Muhammad, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, many people from different cities came and converted to Islam in Madinah. After that, they returned to their various cities. Many of them met the Noble Prophet once, twice, or thrice. These individuals had never heard anything regarding the leadership of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, as the one to whom the Prophet bequeathed leadership, as you always claim.

Our question here is: Is their Islam complete, or is it yet to be completed? Are they practicing a mini-Islam? If you say there is a reduction and that it is a mini-religion, then why didn't the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, complete it for them and explain this important pillar? But if you believe their religion is complete, then what is the essence of the statement that religion is incomplete without acknowledging the leadership of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu?

---

[88] Sunan Ibn Majah 4085; Book 36, Hadith 160; English translation, vol. 5, Book 36, Hadith 4085; https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah/36/160

[89] Sunan Abi Dawud 4284; Book 38, Hadith 6; English translation, Book 37, Hadith 4271; https://sunnah.com/abudawud/38/6

Is this an affirmation that the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, shortened his message? As Khomeini professes in his book "Kashful Asrar," he believed that "The Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, has not completed the message of Allah regarding Ali as he completed Allah's message of his Prophethood"?

REPLY

Our professor's question was based on assumption and since such possibility cannot be ruled out, in sha Allah the question will be answered. However, we need to stress that the message of the Prophet was universal and believed to have reached every Muslim alive then. The last hajj (hajjatul wadah) of the Prophet was the largest gathering during his lifetime. It is estimated that over 100,000 pilgrims across the Muslim world participated. The leadership after the Prophet was part of his messages at Mount Arafah and in Ghadir Khumm. He repeated the message at every possible gathering and traditionally people carried the message to the absentees. In fact, the most transmitted message of the Prophet according to hadith collectors was his last message at Arafah and Ghadir khumm.

- At Arafah

Imam Tirrmidhi documents, narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

I saw the Messenger of Allah during his Hajj, on the Day of Arafah. He was upon his camel Qaswa, giving a Khutbah, so he said: O Mankind! Indeed, I have left among over you, that which if you hold fast to it, you will never go astray: The Book of Allah and my offspring - the ahl al-bayt

حَدَّثَنَا نَصْرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ الْكُوفِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا زَيْدُ بْنُ الْحَسَنِ، هُوَ الأَنْمَاطِيُّ عَنْ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ جَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ رَأَيْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فِي حَجَّتِهِ يَوْمَ عَرَفَةَ وَهُوَ عَلَى نَاقَتِهِ الْقَصْوَاءِ يَخْطُبُ

فَسَمِعْتُهُ يَقُولُ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي قَدْ تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ أَخَذْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا كِتَابَ اللَّهِ وَعِتْرَتِي أَهْلَ بَيْتِي

Grade: Sahih (Darussalam)[90]

The universality of the message was highlighted when he says, "O Mankind!" Furthermore, he let them realize his appointees after him – Quran and his offspring, the Ahl al-Bayt. And lastly, he emphasised the need to follow them both using a singular pronoun "it" for them since they will never separate from each other. Then, he attached following them both to salvation after him, "I have left among over you, that which if you hold fast to it, you will never go astray."

- At Ghadir Khumm, Prophet repeated the same message.

Narrated Zaid bin Arqam, may Allah be pleased with both of them: that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said:

إِنِّي تَارِكٌ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ تَمَسَّكْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا بَعْدِي أَحَدُهُمَا أَعْظَمُ مِنَ الآخَرِ كِتَابُ اللَّهِ حَبْلٌ مَمْدُودٌ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ إِلَى الأَرْضِ وَعِتْرَتِي أَهْلُ بَيْتِي وَلَنْ يَتَفَرَّقَا حَتَّى يَرِدَا عَلَيَّ الْحَوْضَ فَانْظُرُوا كَيْفَ تَخْلُفُونِي فِيهِمَا

"Indeed, I am leaving among you, that which if you hold fast to them, you will never be misguided after me. One of them is greater than the other: The Book of Allah is a rope extended from the sky to the earth, and my offspring - the

---

[90] Jami al-Tirmidhi: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3786Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4155 https://sunnah.com/urn/636690

ahl al-bayt - and they shall not split until they meet at the Hawd, so look at how you deal with them after me.[91]

Grade: Sahih (Darussalam)

Now to the possibility. What is the fate of those who never received the message of Ali's appointment as the successor after the Prophet since his wilayah is attached to perfection of faith?

The Muhammadan Islam is the only religion [after the noble Prophet] that will be accepted before Allah. This is a fact from the Quran. What is the fate of those who never received Muhammadan Islam or those who rejected it after receiving it via propaganda and lies?

These people will definitely not be questioned or judged on what does not reach them. They will only be judged based on what they believed in. Allah says beautifully in His glorious book:

مَّنِ اهْتَدَىٰ فَإِنَّمَا يَهْتَدِي لِنَفْسِهِ وَمَن ضَلَّ فَإِنَّمَا يَضِلُّ عَلَيْهَا وَلَا تَزِرُ وَازِرَةٌ وِزْرَ أُخْرَىٰ وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّىٰ نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا

Whoever goes aright, for his own soul does he go aright; and whoever goes astray, to its detriment only does he go astray: nor can the bearer of a burden bear the burden of another, nor do We chastise until We have sent a messenger."[92]

But those who received the message of Islam in its pure state and lazily or arrogantly or with nonchalant attitude rejected it will definitely regret on the day of judgement.

---

[91] Jami al-Tirmidhi: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3788; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4157 https://sunnah.com/urn/636710

[92] Surah Al-Isra, Verse 15

If this is understood and agreed upon, then it perfectly answered the question on the fate of those who never received the message of the Ahl al-Bayt's leadership.

CHAPTER NINE

ALI IN THE SIX-MAN SHURAH COMMITTEE

Question 9:

It is a known fact that the Shi'ites claim that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, is the person who has the right to leadership, and that the successors before him were tyrants who came to power by force. Then why was he a member of a constituted six-man committee during the demise of Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, from which a successor would be selected?

The details are as follows: When Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, was in the process of dying after being stabbed while praying, he became optimistic that he would die. Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, then announced six names, from among whom a new leader would emerge. He testified that all of them were equal to the task and qualified, and that their relationship with the Noble Prophet was cordial. These six people were: Uthman bin Affan, Ali bin Abi Talib, Abdurrahman bin Auf, Talhah bin Ubaidullah, Zubair bin Awwam, and Sa'ad bin Waqqas. They were given an ultimatum of three days to announce who should be the next leader, and an interim government was constituted.

During the first sitting of that committee (Shurah), they agreed that three should step down and let the contest be between the other three. However, one of them (from the three contesting) stepped down with the consensus that he would choose between the remaining two, Uthman and Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu. Abdurrahman bin Auf was then given three more days to decide who should be the new leader. After various consultations with the Muslim ummah, he nominated Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, who emerged as the new leader (Khalifah) of the Muslims.

Our question here is: Why didn't Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, tell them that he was the person initially chosen by Allah, Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala, and that the rest should automatically withdraw? Why did he accept membership in the Shurah if he knew that his right would be taken away from him? If he knew about the initial bequest of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, then what is the essence of contesting for the office?

THE REPLY

First, Ali ibn Abi Talib partook in the six-man committee appointed by Umar Ibn al-Khattab to fight for what had been deprived of him. We have in previous chapters convincingly established his appointment via various declaration of the Prophet. We have also submitted the Prophet's advice to him to be patient since the Ummah will betray him after him (the Prophet).

Second, it is not the seat of authority per se that Ali ibn Abi Talib was interested in rather, it was his divine responsibility to guide the society by ensuring the law of Allah and Sunnah of His Prophet are preserved and not corrupted. There are lots of narrations which revealed his opposition to the previous Caliphs' wrong judgements. And on many occasions, he corrected their blunders and also helped them. Sometimes they listened, sometimes they don't. Ali Ibn Abi Talib was a large-hearted individual whose main concern is preservation of Islam.

Third, our Prof. was too economical with the truth. What happened at the six-man committee's meetings to the final appointment of the third Caliph was far more than the well-dressed story he presented. In fact, when the six-man committe was first appointed, history quoted Ali's remarks.

Imam Jarir Tabari documents:

Ali said, 'By God, the caliphate has again been taken away from us (the ahl al-Bayt) because the final authority rests in the hands of Abdur-Rahman, who is an old friend and

brother-in-law of Uthman, whereas Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas is Abdur-Rahman's cousin from Banu Zuhra; naturally these three will support each other, and even if Zubair and Talha vote for me it would be of no use.'[93]

And indeed, the vote of Talha and Zubair were of no use because the final authority rests with Abdur-Rahman Ibn Awf. Imam Jarir Tabari further documents how Ali ibn Abi Talib was schemed out. He documents:

"... then he [Abdur-Rahman ibn Awf] turned to Ali and Uthman and said, 'I have asked about you and about others. I find that the people regard no one as equal to you two. Will you, 'Ali, give me your oath of office based on God's Book, the practice of His Prophet, and the deeds of Abu Bakr and Umar? [Ali] replied, 'Indeed no, but [only] based on my own effort (ijtihad) in all this and in accordance with my own ability.' [Abdur-Rahman ibn Awf] turned to Uthman and said, 'Will you give me your oath of office based on God's Book, the practice of His Prophet, and the deeds of Abu Bakr and Umar?' [Uthman] said, 'Indeed yes.' Then [Abdur-Rahman ibn Awf] made a sign with his hand to his shoulders and said, 'if you will come this way!' So, we got up and went to the mosque where someone gave out the cry, 'Everyone in for prayer! ...He [Abdur-Rahman] went up into the minbar where he stood for a long time. Then he said a prayer that the people did not hear.

[Abdur-Rahman] then spoke, "O people, I have questioned you in secret and openly on the question of [who will be] your leader. I have found that none of you regard [anyone else] as equal to one of these two, Ali or Uthman. Come forward to me, Ali.' He did so and stood beneath the minbar. Abdur-Rahman took his hand and said, " Will you give me your oath of office based on God's

---

[93] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-Tabari, Tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879 – 1901), volume 1, pp. 2780; Ahmad Ibn Yahya Ibn Jabir al-Baladhuri, Ansab al-Ashraf (edition. S. D. F. Goitein, Jerusalem 19936), volume 5, pp. 19

Book, the practice of His Prophet, and the deeds of Abu Bakr and Umar?"

He replied, No, but based on my own effort (ijtihad) in all this and in accordance with my own ability." [Abdur-Rahman] let go of [Ali's] hand and called out, "come forward to me, Uthman." He took him by his hand, as [Uthman] stood where Ali had stood, and said, "Will you give me your oath of office based on God's Book, the practice of His Prophet, and the deeds of Abu Bakr and Umar?' [Uthman] replied, 'Indeed yes!" So (Abdur-Rahman) stretched right up to the ceiling of the mosque, his hand still in Uthman's hand. Then he said, "O God, hear and bear witness! O God, I have placed what was my own responsibility in all this upon Uthman." The people crowded round to give Uthman the oath of allegiance..." [94]

It was a well-planned scheme. They knew Ali will never follow the "sunnah of Abu Bakr and Umar". And they knew he will never lie or pretend to get what belongs to him. What were these "sunnah of Abu Bakr and Umar" that Ali refused to follow? For brevity, we give just one example.

Imam Nasai documents:

عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عُمَرَ يَقُولُ وَاللَّهِ إِنِّي لأَنْهَاكُمْ عَنِ الْمُتْعَةِ، وَإِنَّهَا لَفِي كِتَابِ اللَّهِ وَلَقَدْ فَعَلَهَا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَعْنِي الْعُمْرَةَ فِي الْحَجِّ

Narrated Ibn 'Abbās:

I heard 'Umar saying: "By Allāh, I hereby forbid you from doing Hajj al-Tamattu', even though it is in the Book of

---

[94] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-Tabari, Tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk – The History of al-Tabari [An annotated Translation], volume XIV (The conquest of Iran) [Translated by G. Rex Smith (The University of Manchester)]; The state University of New York Press), ppg. 159 – 160

Allāh and the Messenger of Allāh did it", meaning doing 'Umrah during Hajj."[95]

Sheikh Al-Albani comments: Sahih (Authentic)

Uthman ibn Affan as promised followed the "sunnah of Abu Bakr and Umar" in opposition to the Sunnah of Allah and His Prophet.

Imam Nasai also documents:

أَخْبَرَنَا إِسْحَاقُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ، قَالَ أَنْبَأَنَا أَبُو عَامِرٍ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ، عَنِ الْحَكَمِ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَلِيَّ بْنَ حُسَيْنٍ، يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ مَرْوَانَ، أَنَّ عُثْمَانَ، نَهَى عَنِ الْمُتْعَةِ، وَأَنْ يَجْمَعَ الرَّجُلُ بَيْنَ الْحَجِّ وَالْعُمْرَةِ فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ لَبَّيْكَ بِحَجَّةٍ وَعُمْرَةٍ مَعًا . فَقَالَ عُثْمَانُ أَتَفْعَلُهَا وَأَنَا أَنْهَى عَنْهَا فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ لَمْ أَكُنْ لأَدَعَ سُنَّةَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لأَحَدٍ مِنَ النَّاسِ

It was narrated that Al-Hakam said:

I heard 'Ali bin Husain narrating from Marwan, that 'Uthman FORBADE Mut'ah and joining Hajj and "Umrah. 'Ali said; 'Labbaika bi Hajjatin wa 'Umratin ma'an - Here I am, (O Allah) for Hajj and 'Umrah together'.

Uthman said: 'Are you doing this when I have forbidden it?' 'Ali said; 'I will not give up the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah for any of the people."[96]

---

[95] Sunan an-Nasa'i 2736; In-book reference : Book 24, Hadith 0; English translation : Vol. 3, Book 24, Hadith 2737; https://sunnah.com/urn/1079050

[96] Sunan an-Nasa'i 2723; In-book reference : Book 24, Hadith 0; English translation : Vol. 3, Book 24, Hadith 2724; https://sunnah.com/urn/1078930

Indeed, Ali was the rightly guided Khalifah after the Prophet.

CHAPTER TEN

WAS ABU BAKR APPOINTED TO LEAD SALAT?

Question 10:

If what you are claiming is a fact—that the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, wished Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, to be his successor and even made an effort to inform his companions—then it is a known fact that under Islamic doctrine, a leader is someone who is supposed to lead prayers. Why didn't the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, instruct Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, to lead prayers, even if it was just once before the demise of the Prophet?

Either from our books or yours, from our source of history or yours, is there any source that establishes Ali,

Radiyallahu Anhu, as having led prayers, even once? From both our books and yours, we know that Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu, led prayers. However, there is no source that informs us that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, has led prayers. Why? And you say he is the leader by bequest/will!

THE REPLY

First, it is not a claim rather it is an established fact that Prophet did appoint Ali Ibn Abi Talib as his successor. Alhamdulillah, this fact has been proven beyond doubt.

Second, yes, it is a known fact that leader of the community usually leads his people in salat. Unfortunately, the case of Abu Bakr (if at all he was ever appointed to lead salat) wasn't such case. The noble Prophet was still very much alive though sick. He was still the leader and Imam jama'ah of the Ummah. In fact, during this sickness, he used to come out supported by Ali and Abbas to lead people in salat. Our professor used this Sunni feeble argument very wrongly. What Sunni scholars used to put forward with this argument is that the appointment of Abu Bakr to lead salat (if at all it was true) is a hint he was to succeed the Prophet.

Therefore, it is only an indication not a confirmation to be the successor after the Prophet. Our question is that if Sunni can interpret the alleged appointment of Abu Bakr to lead salat as an indication [he was] to succeed the Prophet, why did they find it difficult to accept Prophet declarations [Ali is my Khalifah over all the believers after me; Whosoever Allah and His Messenger are his Mawla, Ali is his Mawla; Ali is the Wali of every believer after me] as a clear and unambiguous confirmation of Ali's leadership after the Prophet?

Third, as against our professor's imagination, Shi'a neither agreed nor reject the totality of Abu Bakr leading the people in salat. In sha Allah, very soon we are going to expose the falsity of the reports on Abu Bakr's appointment to lead the salat and even weigh the merit of its possibility.

However, before then, our Prof. challenged us to bring prove that Ali ibn Abi Talib ever led the believers in salat.

It is a known fact with many evidences that Ali ibn Abi Talib led many expeditions and traditionally, the commander in chief is always the Imam of his soldiers.

For example, Imam Bukhari documents: Narrated `Aisha:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) sent (an army unit) under the command of a man who used to lead his companions in the prayers and would finish his recitation with (the Sura 112): 'Say (O Muhammad): "He is Allah, the One." '(112.1) When they returned (from the battle), they mentioned that to the Prophet. He said (to them), "Ask him why he does so." They asked him and he said, "I do so because it mentions the qualities of the Beneficent and I love to recite it (in my prayer)." The Prophet; said (to them), "tell him that Allah loves him.[97]

حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ صَالِحٍ، حَدَّثَنَا ابْنُ وَهْبٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَمْرٌو، عَنِ ابْنِ أَبِي هِلَالٍ، أَنَّ أَبَا الرِّجَالِ، مُحَمَّدَ بْنَ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ حَدَّثَهُ عَنْ أُمِّهِ، عَمْرَةَ بِنْتِ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ وَكَانَتْ فِي حَجْرِ عَائِشَةَ زَوْجِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم عَنْ عَائِشَةَ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم بَعَثَ رَجُلًا عَلَى سَرِيَّةٍ، وَكَانَ يَقْرَأُ لأَصْحَابِهِ فِي صَلاَتِهِ فَيَخْتِمُ بِـ { قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ } فَلَمَّا رَجَعُوا ذَكَرُوا ذَلِكَ لِلنَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَقَالَ سَلُوهُ لأَىِّ شَىْءٍ يَصْنَعُ ذَلِكَ فَسَأَلُوهُ فَقَالَ لأَنَّهَا صِفَةُ الرَّحْمَنِ، وَأَنَا أُحِبُّ أَنْ أَقْرَأَ بِهَا فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم أَخْبِرُوهُ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّهُ

This unmentioned man was no other than Ali ibn Abi Talib. Ibn Abbas revealed to us in yet another hadith

[97] Sahih al-Bukhari 7375; In-book reference : Book 97, Hadith 5; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 9, Book 93, Hadith 472; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/97/5

narrated by Aisha that, "He was Ali Ibn Abi Talib, but she (Aisha) is averse to name him in a good context."[98]

EXPOSING THE FALSITY OF ABU BAKR'S APPOINTMENT TO LEAD SALAT

The results of the examination of all the ahadith under this topic are too contradictory and weak to be accepted as valid argument. Following are the summary:

- Report of Anas ibn Malik: Prophet was unable to lead the congregation or participated in the jama'ah for a total of three days until he died on Monday (four days in total). Abu Bakr led prayer during these days.[99]
- Report of Aishah: In this hadith she described the illness of the Prophet in his last days for Ubaydullah Ibn Abdullah. It is gathered from this hadith that Prophet fainted and woke up three times on his attempt to lead people in salat. He however ordered that Abu Bakr should lead people in salat. Whilst in the middle of Salat, Prophet came out supported by one man and Abbas (at another version of this hadith by Aishah, it was al-Fadl ibn Abbas and one man). He was seated beside Abu Bakr and lead the Prayer in the sitting position: Abu Bakr was following the Prophet and people were following Abu Bakr who was in a standing position.[100] Abdullah Ibn Abbas later revealed the "one man" to be Ali.
- Report of Abdullah Ibn Zam'a: In this report, Prophet ordered that SOMEONE should lead people in salat to which Umar ibn al-Khattab was

---

[98] Musnad Ahmad bin Hanbal, Volume 6 page 228 Tradition 25956 www.islamport.com/d/1/mtn/1/89/3525.html

[99] Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī al-Naysābūrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 1, p. 315, # 419 (100)

[100] Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī al-Naysābūrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 1, p. 311, # 418 (90), (95)

asked to lead salat due to the absence of Abu Bakr. When Prophet discovered Umar was leading people in salat, he said, "Allah and the believers forbid that", and sent for Abu Bakr. By the time Abu Bakr could come, Umar had finished the salat. Then, Abu Bakr led the people in salat.[101]

Did Abu Bakr Lead The Prophet?!

- Report of Aishah: Abu Bakr led the people in salat while the Messenger of Allah was in the congregation row behind him.[102]
- Report of Aishah: Messenger of Allah ordered Abu Bakr to lead the people in salat. Then she (Aishah) said in the same hadith: "The Prophet was in front of Abu Bakr, and he performed the salat in a sitting posture while Abu Bakr led the people in salat and the people were behind Abu Bakr.[103]

Of course, all these are grave contradictions that can never be reconciled. Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) was unable to hide this fact:

Muslim b. Ibrāhīm narrated from Shu'bah with the wording, "The Prophet, peace be upon him, performed salat behind Abu Bakr". AlMundhir recorded it. This is in contrast to the narration of Abu Musa, AND IT IS A SEVERE CONTRADICTION. Moreover, there is A FURTHER CONTRADICTION in the report of Masrūq.

---

[101] Abū Dāwud Sulaymān b. al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī al-Azdī, *Sunan* (Dār al-Fikr) [annotator: Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī], vol. 2, p. 627, # 4660

[102] Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān b. Aḥmad b. Ḥibbān b. Mu'ādh b. Ma'bad al-Tamīmī alDārimī al-Bustī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān bi Tartīb Ibn Balbān* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risālah; 2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotators: Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī and Shu'ayb al-Arnāūt], vol. 5, p.483, # 2117; *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan al-Tirmidhī* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī], vol. 2, p. 196, # 362

[103] Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasāī, *al-Mujtabā min al-Sunan* (Ḥalab: Maktab al-Maṭbū'āt al-Islāmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1406 H) [annotator: Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn alAlbānī], vol. 2, p. 83, # 797

It is recorded by Ibn Ḥibbān in the report of 'Āṣim, from Shaqīq from him (i.e. Masrūq) with the wording, "Abū Bakr was following his ṣalāt (i.e. that of the Prophet), and the people were following the ṣalāt of Abū Bakr.[104]

Allamah al-Albani also writes:

In this report, it is stated that the Prophet, peace be upon him, was the Imām (in the ṣalāt), in contradiction to the first one which states that he was a follower (in the ṣalāt). The 'ulamā are in disagreement over the methods to harmonize the two reports. Al-Ḥāfiẓ mentioned them (i.e. those methods) in al-Fatḥ. The first of them is that the Prophet, peace be upon him, performed two ṣalāts in the mosque. In one of them, he was a follower (of Abū Bakr), and in the other, he was the Imām (of Abū Bakr). This was the opinion of Ibn Ḥazm in alMuḥallā (3/47) and al-Bayhaqī, and before him, Ibn Ḥibbān. [105]

Even if we put aside Anas ibn malik report that Prophet never came out to pray in a congregation throughout his four days illness until he passed, the above as explained by Albani and Ibn Hajar are not of this world.

Was he even qualify to lead the salat (I)?

- A so-called sahih hadith says Abu Bakr led the Prophet in salat. This is a haram act. Allah says:

"O you who believe! Be not forward in the presence of Allah and His Messenger, and fear Allah..." [surah al-Hujurat: 1]

Imam al-Mubarakfuri states:

---

[104] Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Beirut: Dār alMa'rifah li al-Ṭabā'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 2, p. 13

[105] Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Aṣl Ṣifat Ṣalāt al-Nabī* (Riyādh: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī'; 1st edition, 1427 H), vol. 1, p. 84

That is narrated from Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ. He said, "It is not correct for anyone to lead in ṣalāt in a sitting posture other than him, peace be upon him." He said, "And this is the famous statement of Mālik and the majority of his companions." He said, "And this is the most correct of the opinions, because it is NOT correct to lead in front of him in ṣalāt or in anything else, whether due to an excuse or otherwise."[106]

Al-Hafiz also adds:

He (Qadi Iyad) cited as proof also the fact that he, peace be upon him, led them in ṣalāt in a sitting posture, because it is NOT correct to lead in front of him, due to the prohibition of that by Allāh"[107]

Abu Bakr himself said:

- Imam Muslim (d. 261 H):

Abu Bakr said, "It is NOT for the son of Abu Quhafah (i.e. Abu Bakr) to lead salat in front of the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him.[108]

In short, all the ahadith that state Abu Bakr led the Prophet in salat were fabrication; yet, Sunni ahadith scholars deceitfully graded them as sahih (authentic).

Was he even qualify to lead the salat (II)?

- If Abu Bakr wasn't qualified to lead the Prophet in salat, what about the people?

---

[106] Abū al-'Alā Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm al-Mubārakfūrī, *Tuḥfat alAḥwazī bi Sharḥ Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1410 H), vol. 2, p. 294

[107] Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Beirut: Dār alMa'rifah li al-Ṭabā'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 2, p. 146

[108] Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī al-Naysābūrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 1, p. 316, # 421 (102)

Imam Muslim documents this ground rule: Abu Mas'ud al-Ansari:

The Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, said: "The people should be led in ṣalāt by the best reciter of the Book of Allāh among them…[109]

Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal also documents:

Hittan b. 'Abd Allah al-Raqashi:

Al-Ash'arī led his companions in a ṣalāt ... So, al-'Asharī said, "... Verily, the Prophet of Allāh, peace be upon him, gave us a sermon and taught us our Sunnah, and explained to us our ṣalāt. So, he said, 'Establish your congregational rows. Then, the best reciter among you should be your Imam" [110]

This particular hadith is numerous. We only cite two for brevity. If the Prophet order was that people should be led in salat by their best Quran reciter, then who was the best reciter and how does Abu Bakr fare in this case?

- **Imam Bukhari documents:**

Ibn 'Abbas: 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, said: "The best reciter among us is Ubayy, and the best judge among us is 'Ali.[111]

So, Abu Bakr was not the best reciter.

- Imam Bukhari further documents: Ibn 'Umar, may Allāh be pleased with him:

---

[109] Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī al-Naysābūrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 1, p. 465, # 673 (290)

[110] Abū 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal al-Shaybānī, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muasassat Qurṭubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnāūṭ], vol. 4, p. 409, # 19680

[111] Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. Mughīrah al-Bukhārī al-Ju'fī, *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukhtaṣar* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Muṣṭafā Dīb al-Baghā], vol. 4, p. 1628, # 4211

Sālim, the freed slave of Abu Ḥudhayfah, used to lead the earliest Muhājirūn and the Sahabah of the Prophet, peace be upon him, in salat in the mosque of Qubā. Among them were Abū Bakr, 'Umar, Abū Salamah, and Āmir b. Rabī'ah." [112]

• Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah also documents stating the reason why Salim lead in salat: Ibn 'Umar:

When the Muhajirun fled Makkah, they camped near Quba and Salim, the freed slave of Abu Ḥudhayfah, led them in salat because he was the most knowledgeable of the Qur'an among them. Among them were Abū Salamah b. 'Abd al-Asad and 'Umar b. al-Khattab."[113]

Al-Hafiz (d. 852 H) comments on this version of hadith in sahih al-Bukhari saying:

His statement (and he was the most knowledgeable of the Qur'an among them) is an indicator towards their reason for making him their leader (in ṣalāt) despite that they were of more noble statuses than him. In the report of al-Tabarani, it is narrated: "because he was the most knowledgeable of them of the Qur'an"[114]

CONCLUSION

Aside the fact that all the ahadith on Abu Bakr's appointment to lead people in salat are filled with series of unimaginable contradictions, we have exposed the falsity of the ahadith that say Abu Bakr led the Prophet in salat. Furthermore, those sets of ahadith that say Abu Bakr led

---

[112] Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. Mughīrah al-Bukhārī al-Ju'fī, *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukhtaṣar* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Muṣṭafā Dīb al-Baghā], vol. 6, p. 2625, # 6754; And hadith #7175

[113] Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abī Shaybah Ibrāhīm b. 'Uthmān b. Abī Bakr b. Abī Shaybah al-Kūfī al-'Ubsī, *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah fī al-Aḥādīth wa al-Athār* (Dār al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Prof. Sa'īd al-Laḥām], vol. 1, p. 379, # 11

[114] 'Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Beirut: Dār alMa'rifah li al-Ṭabā'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 2, p. 156

people in salat are also bogus due to the fact that only the best reciter of the holy Quran is entitled to lead people in salat.

Lastly, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani let us realize that even though Salim used to lead Abu Bakr, Umar and host of other Muhajirun in salat due to the fact that he was the best reciter, those Muhajirun were still nobler than him. If this is so, then, we can safely conclude on the following:

- All the ahadith on Abu Bakr's appointment to lead people in salat were fabricated
- However, if those ahadith are authentic despite their grave contradictions and impossibilities, then we can agree for the sake of argument that Abu Bakr did lead people in salat; however, there is no probative merit in it as Ahlu Sunnah want to force it down our throat. Why is this? The case of Salim proved it. He used to lead Abu Bakr, Umar and others because he was the best reciter; yet, Sunni believe Abu Bakr et al were nobler than him.
- With this academic scrutiny, both legs of the question(s) have been destroyed completely.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

ALI'S ROLE IN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE FIRST THREE CALIPHS

Question 11:

Why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, accept so many offers of appointment on different occasions during the reign of Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu? For example, when Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, was to leave for Quds to collect the keys to the third most important and sacred masjid after it was conquered under the leadership of Khalid bin Walid's army, he appointed Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, as the acting Khalifah of Madinah (Governor). At that time, the office was akin to that of a Vice President because he would be the de facto president (Amirul Mu'minin) of the interim administration until a new president was elected as de jure.

Why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, take the office of Special Adviser and the Governorship under an administration that the Shi'ites term un-Islamic and tyrannical? See Nahjul Balagha pp. 325 & 340.

Furthermore, when Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, was on his way to wage war against Iraq and later changed his position and returned to Madinah, he appointed Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, as Governor of Madinah (Vice President). Salman al-Farsi also served as a Governor in Madinah under Umar's reign. Ammar bin Yasir was the Governor in Kufah under the same administration, and these two companions were close associates of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu. See Siyaru A'alamin Nubala'i (vol. 1, pp. 547 & 422).

Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, was also a judge during this same reign. Why didn't he claim and profess his leadership? For that reason, he should have declined to serve under Umar's administration.

THE REPLY

Our professor is not the first to advance this kind of argument and probably might not be the last. This question usually comes out of confusion or inability to understand the personality of Ali on one hand, and the politics of the then Islamic state on the other hand.

First, it is true that Ali ibn Abi Talib was appointed to deputise Caliph Umar twice in Madina when the latter was on expedition. He was also one of the Caliph's advisers and consultants. Even during the time of the first Caliph, he was consulted on several occasions. This apparently signifies fraternity; then, how could the Shi'a claim there was problem between them as a result of Khilafah [leadership] issue?

Naturally, what the Professor and others with this thought expected is "rift, fight, war".

Second, apart from the documented evidences that Ali "served" Caliph Umar's government on several occasions, we also have abundant reports that reveal the extent of problem that existed between them. Here, we highlight [just] three instances:

- **During the reign of Abu Bakr:**

When Abu Bakr became Caliph, Ali, his family and associates refused to recognise the leadership of Abu Bakr. Ali eventually paid the Caliph oath of allegiance after the demise of his wife, Fatimah the daughter of the Prophet (who never recognised the leadership of Abu Bakr till her death) when he discovered people's attitude towards him has changed. This was six months after Abu Bakr's assumption to power.[115]

During this period, 'Ali ibn Abi Talib cut himself off their affairs although there were instances, he used to advice and guide them if the Caliph is about to make grave decision.

---

[115] Sahih al-Bukhari 6830; In-book reference: Book 86, Hadith 57USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 8, Book 82, Hadith 817; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/86/57

- **During the reign of Umar:**

Imam Tabari in his Tarikh documents an interesting conversation that took place between Ibn Abbas and Caliph Umar. He writes:

Ibn Humayd – Salamah – Muhammad Ibn Ishaq – a source[116] – Ikrimah – Ibn Abbas:

Umar asked Ibn Abbas, "Why did 'Ali not join us and co-operate with us? Why did the Quraysh not support your family while your father is the uncle and you are the cousin of the Prophet?" "I do not know," replied Ibn Abbas. "But I know the reason," said 'Umar. "Because the Quraysh did not like to allow both the Nubuwah and the Khilafah to be combined in your house (Bani Hashim), for with this you would feel arrogant and rejoice. The Quraysh therefore prefered to choose the leader for themselves and they made the right choice and were guided by God in that." Ibn Abbas replied, "O Amir al-Mu'minin, as for your statement that the Quraysh chose their own leader and were guided in their choice, it may be correct if the choice...was in the same sense as the choice of God from among the Quraysh.

As for your statement that the Quraysh did not like to allow both the Nubuwah and the Khilafah with us, it is not surprising, for God has described many people who disliked 'what God has sent down to them and thus render their deeds fruitless (Q. XLVII: 9)'.

At this point Umar became angry and said, "I have heard many things about you but I ignored them because of my regards for you. I am told that you think that we have taken away the caliphate from you through oppression and because of envy."

Ibn Abbas said, "As for oppression, it is evident and as concerns envy, so it is obvious; Satan envied Adam and we are the children of Adam."

---

[116] Imam Tabari in other chain revealed the source to be "Husayn ibn Abdallah.

Umar lost his temper and retorted, "Alas, O Banu Hashim, your hearts are full of hatred, rancour and false pretensions."

Ibn Abbas said, "Be gentle, O Amir al-mu'minin, and do not describe the hearts of the people from whom God has removed all kinds of uncleanliness and purified them with complete purification (Q. XXXIII: 33). Moreover, the Prophet himself belonged to the Banu Hashim.' Umar said, "Let us leave this topic." [117]

Interestingly, there are few Sunni athar (narration) ascribed to Ali ibn Abi Talib praising both Abu Bakr and Umar as the best of the Ummah. Alas! Umar himself revealed the intention of Ali and Abbas when both made a 'play' to remind the Caliph of his error just like the two litigants who came to Prophet Dawud. Imam Muslim in a very long narration document:

"... He (Umar) said: When the Messenger of Allah passed away, Abu Bakr said:" I am the wali (successor) of the Messenger of Allah....so both of you (Ali and Abbas) thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest... When Abu Bakr passed away and (I have become) the wali (successor) of the Messenger of Allah and wali (successor) of Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him), so both of you (Ali and Abbas) thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest...."[118]

WHY THEY NEED ALI?!

There is no doubt that there was problem of khilafah [leadership] between Ali, Abu Bakr and Umar. Why the Caliphs continue to invite Ali into their affairs can either be "keeping your friend close and your enemy closer" or "admittance to their incompetence to rule; thereby, the need of Ali's knowledge." We have quoted a hadith earlier

---

[117] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, *tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk* (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 1, pp.2769-2770.

[118] Sahih Muslim 1757 c; In-book reference: Book 32, Hadith 58; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book19, Hadith 4349; https://sunnah.com/muslim/32/58

where Umar confirmed Ali to be the best judge of the Ummah. Yet, report that Ali was a judge during Umar's reign is doubtful. Imam Jarir Tabari documents:

Al-Muqaddami – Ishaq al-Farwi – Ubaydallah ibn Umar – Nafi' Ibn Umar:

Umar put Abdur-Rahman ibn Awf in charge of the pilgrimage in the year in which he began to rule; thus ... Umar's governor of Makkah was 'Attab ibn Asid. Uthman ibn Abi al-Asi was in charge of al-Ta'if, Ya'la ibn Munyah was in charge of Yemen, Hudhayfah ibn Mihsan was in charge of Bahrayn, Abu Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrah was in charge of Syria, and al-Muthanna ibn Harithah was in charge of the frontier of al-Kufah and that part of its land which had been conquered. Ali ibn Abi Talib – according to what has been reported – was in charge of the judiciary. It has also been said that during his reign 'Umar had no judge."[119]

However, what is clear is that history records several instances where the Caliphs ran to Ali for bail outs in decision making and answers to difficulties. For example, Imam Jarir Tabari again documents:

According to al-Sari – Shu'ayb – Sayf – Muhammad – Ubaydullah b. Umar:

When Umar received the news about the conquest of al-Qadisiyyah and Damascus, he assembled the people in Madina and said: 'I was formerly a merchant, and God provided sufficently for my family by means of my commerce. Now you have made me preoccupied with your affair. What do you think, how much of this property can I legally keep?" The people suggested a large amount, while 'Ali (b. Abi Talib) remained silent. Umar said: What do you say, O Ali? and Ali replied, [You can have] what will keep you and your family in a moderately good condition, but you have no right to this property beyond

[119] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 11, pp.224 – 225

that." The people said: The [right] words are the words of Ibn Abi Talib."[120]

Even the avowed enemy of Ali, Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan who rebelled, plotted and waged war against Ali never felt shy from sending people to Ali to guide and answer his questions. And they knew Ali would never betray or turn them down even if he's at greater advantage.

SERVING ISLAM

We have once established that Ali's main concern was Islam, not the seat. If Ali abandoned the Caliphs totally and Islam suffered as a result, he will be judged. Ali was trained by the Prophet and Allah praised his Prophet for his lofty characters and large heart. Prophet knew the Munafiqun from amongst his followers; yet, he never exposed or rebuked them publicly.

Even those sahabah who attempted to assassinate him, though they were cursed but Prophet never revealed their names.[121]When Abdullah ibn Salul, the commander-in-chief of the Munafiqun died, Prophet prayed to his janazah (even if that does not avail him). Did these instances indicate fraternity between the Prophet and Munafiqun? Prophet's concern was Islam. So was Ali ibn Abi Talib. If Ali should result to rebellion and civil war, the young Islam will be in great danger and her enemies will find a perfect opportunity to devour it from all angles. History will never forgive Ali for that. A golden example was Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan who rebelled and waged war against Ali under the pretense of avenging Uthman; and also, against al-

---

[120] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 12, pp.204

[121] Sahih Muslim 2779 c; In-book reference: Book 51, Hadith 14; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 38, Hadith 6690; https://sunnah.com/muslim/51/14; Sahih Muslim 2779 a; In-book reference: Book 51, Hadith 12; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 38, Hadith 6688; https://sunnah.com/muslim/51/12

Hasan after the demise of Ali. Islam suffered and had set backs that lasted negatively even to these days.

In conclusion, Ali's "rapport" with Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman's government was about preservation of Islam.

CHAPTER TWELVE

WHY DID ALI NOT WRESTLE HIS RIGHT?

Question 12:

Why didn't Ali bin Abi Talib, Radiyallahu Anhu, climb the mimbar of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, even once just to inform the Ummah about his right? For example, he could have said: "Oh people! Remember that the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, instructed me to lead you, so go against these tyrants." This could have been done if the three successors who came before him were truly tyrants, as you claim.

THE REPLY

Before we answer this question, it is imperative to reveal the situation immediately after the demise of the Prophet. The Sunni Imam, Jarir Tabari documents:

Ibn Humayd – Jarir – Mughirah – Abu Ma'shar Ziyad Ibn Kulayb – Abu Ayyub – Ibrahim:

When the Messenger of Allah died, Abu Bakr was not present, and he came after three [hours]. No one dared to uncover the Messenger of God's face... [When] Abu Bakr [came, he] uncovered [the Prophet's] face and kissed [his forehead] between his two eyes... Umar was telling [the people that] the Prophet was not dead and he was threatening to kill [those who maintained that the Prophet was dead].

The Ansar gathered in a roofed building [saqifah] of the Banu Sa'idah to render their oath of allegiance to Sa'd b. Ubadah. This news reached Abu Bakr, so he came to them with Umar and Abu Ubaydah b. al-Jarrah, asking [them] why [they had gathered]. They replied, "Let us have a ruler [amir] from us and another from you." Abu Bakr said, "The rulers [umara'] will be from us, and viziers [wuzara] from you." Abu Bakr then added, 'I am pleased [to offer] you one of these two men: Umar or Abu Ubaydah. Some

people came to the Prophet asking him to send a trustworthy man with them, and he sent Abu Ubaydah b. al-Jarrah. I am pleased [to offer] you Abu Ubaydah."

Umar stood up saying, "Who among you would be agreeable to leave Abu Bakr whom the Prophet gave precedence?' And he [Umar] gave him oath of allegiance. The people followed [Umar]. The Ansar said, or some of them said, "We will not give the oath of allegiance [to anyone] except 'Ali."

Ibn Humayd – Jarir – Mughirah – Abu Ma'shar Ziyad Ibn Kulayb:

Umar b. al-Khattab came to the house of Ali. Talha, al-Zubayr, and some of the Muhajirun were [also] in the house [with Ali]. Umar cried out, "By God, either you come out to render the oath of allegiance [to Abu Bakr], or I will set the house on fire." Al-Zubayr came out with his sword drawn. As he stumbled [upon something], the sword fell from his hand, so they [Umar's entourage] jumped over him and seized him."[122]

If Umar was that desperate to coerce people to pay oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr and even willed to burn the house of Fatimah which was a safe haven for those who refused to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr, what would have happened had Ali climbed the minbar and demanded his right? A group of the Ansar was ready to rebel and revolt if they see an opportunity. A part of muhajirun who were with Ali was also ready to revolt. Infact, history had it that Abu Sufyan offered Ali ibn Abi Talib a regiment which Ali turned down.

Had Ali ever taken to the minbar to demand his right, it would have been misinterpreted and taken as an opportunity especially by the Munafiqun [whose intention was to see Islam shattered] and the outside enemies to

---

[122] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 09, pp.185 – 187.

attack the Islamic establishment. Such move will be counter productive and Islamic state would have suffered since all the oppositions were concentrated in the same city, Madina. Ash-Sharif ar-Radi has documented the sermon of Imam Ali in Kufah while making reference to this period:

"Nay, by God, the son of Abu Quhafa [Abu Bakr] had exacted the caliphate for himself while he knew fully well that my position in it was like that of the pivot in a mill; the flood waters flow down beneath me and the birds do not soar high up to me; yet I hung up a curtain before it and turned aside from it [the caliphate]. I then started thinking whether I should attack with a severing hand or should watch patiently the blind darkness in which the old man becomes decrepit and the young man old, in which the believer tries his utmost till he meets his Lord, and I came to the conclusion that patience in a situation like this was wiser. So I adopted patience, although there was a mote rankling in my eye and a bone sticking in my throat on seeing my heritage being plundered, till the first one [Abu Bakr] died and handed over the reins of the caliphate to another person ['Umar] after him. [Here Ali quotes a verse from the poet A'sha, which reads] «How vast is the difference between this day of mine when I am on the back of the camel [i.e. suffering from the hardship of a rough journey] and the day of Hayyan, brother of Jabir [i.e. when he was comfortably placed under the power and prestige of Hayyan].

How hard did they [Abu Bakr and 'Umar] squeeze its udders and how they made it [the caliphate] travel on a rugged path, which inflicts deep wounds and is rough to the touch, in which one stumbles frequently and has to offer excuses, so that its rider is like the rider of a difficult mount: if he draws its reins tight, its nose is pierced, and if he relaxes it, he plunges into destruction. And so the people were afflicted, by God, with stumbling, refractoriness, capriciousness, and cross-purposes. But I kept patience in

spite of the length of time and the severity of the ordeal, until he ['Umar] went his way."[123]

It is widely known how Abu Bakr secretly willed the seat of authority to Umar without consulting a single Muslim at the time. And we have given the brief account of how Uthman got to the seat of authority. This period was a bad timing for Ali to protest his right. Imam Ali succumbed to the political situation of his time and chose the path of patience. After all, the Prophet has foretold that the Ummah will betray him.

The Sunni historian, Al-Baladhuri (d. 279 H) documents:

Al-Baladhuri:

Narrated to me Ruh ibn Abdul Momin from Abi Awanah from Khalid Al-Hadha'a from Abdur Rahman ibn Abi Bakrah that Ali came to them for a visit and he said: "Nobody from this Ummah has suffered like I did when Rasool Allah (saw) died, and I was the one who had the right to this (Caliphate) more than anyone, but Bay'ah was given to Abu Bakr and Umar succeeded him, so I gave Bay'ah and I submitted and accepted. Then people gave Bay'ah to Uthman so I gave Bay'ah and I submitted and accepted and now they are swaying between me and Mu'awiyah!"[124]

Ibn Al-Athīr also documents:

Narrated Yahya ibn Mahmood from Al-Hassan ibn Ahmad in his teaching class from Aboo Nu'aym from Aboo Alee Muhammd ibn Ahmad Al-Hasan from Abdullah ibn Muhammd from Ibraheem ibn Yusuf Al-Sirafi from Yahya ibn Urwa Al-Muradi who said: I heard Ali saying: "The Prophet (saw) died, and I saw myself the most deserving for this matter (i.e. Caliphate). But then the Muslims gathered around Abu Bakr, so I obeyed and accepted. Then when Abu Bakr was dying, I thought he would not refrain it from me, but he gave it to Umar, so I

---

[123] Nahj al-Balagha, khutbah ash-Shaqshaqiyah.

[124] Ahmad ibn Yahya Al-Baladhuri, *Ansaab Al-Ashraaf* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr). Vol. 2, Pg. # 402.

accepted and obeyed. Then when Umar was dying, I thought he would not refrain it from me, but he put the decision for a council of six and made me one of them. But then they elected Uthman for leadership, so I accepted and obeyed. Then when Uthman was killed, they came to me and gave Bay'ah to me willingly, not by force, but then they left my Bay'ah. By Allah (swt)! I cannot find (any solution) except the sword or disbelief in what Allah (swt) has revealed to Muhammad (saw)."[125]

When 'Ali finally got to the seat of authority, an incident happened at Rahbah in Kufa where he climbed the minbar and addressed people. Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents:

Abu Tufayl (RA) has narrated that 'Alī (RA) gathered the people in an open place and said to them:

I make every Muslim swear and ask him if he has heard the Prophet (Peace be upon him) say something (about me) on the day of Ghadir Khum, he should stand up. At this, thirty persons stood up — while Abu Nu'aym said that a larger number of people stood up — and they bore witness that (we remember that time) when the Messenger of Allah (Peace be upon him) said to the people while holding your hand: Do you know that I am more entitled over the lives of the believers? All of them said: yes, O Messenger of Allāh! Then he said: one who has me as his master has this ('Alī) as his master. O Allāh! Befriend him who befriends him ('Alī) and be his enemy who is his ('Alī's) enemy.

The narrator (Abu Tufayl) says that when I came out I had some doubt. In the meantime, I met Zayd bin Arqam (RA) and told him that I had heard 'Alī (RA) say this. At this Zayd bin Arqam (RA) said: how can you deny while I have

---

[125] Ibn Al-Athīr, *Usd Al-Ghaba Fi Ma'rifat Al-Sahaba*. Vol. 4, Pg. # 106.

myself heard the Messenger (SAW) say this about 'Alī (RA)?"[126]

Sheikh Shu'aib al-Ar'naut comments:

The Isnad of this report is "SAHIH" and the Rijaal are all "thiqa (trustworthy) and rijal of Bukhari and Muslim" except for Fatr bin Khalifa who is amongst Rijaal of Sunnan and Imam Bukhari (rah) narrated from him in Maqrunan form.

Abu Tufayl did not witness the event of Ghadir khum; hence, his doubt at initial stage. He later became an ardent Shi'a of Imam Ali and was at the forefront in all Ali's battles.

In conclusion, it will be counter productive had Ali mount the minbar and fought for his right at that tensed and fragile period that was fill with betrayal and disloyalty.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

WHY DIDN'T HE FIGHT HIS WAY TOTHE SEAT?

Question 13:

Is Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, not a warrior? Where is his warrior spirit? Why didn't he fight those who took away

---

[126] Abū 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal b. Hilāl b. Asad al-Shaybānī, *Musnad* (Muasassat al-Risālah; 1st edition, 1421 H) [annotators: Shu'ayb al-Arnāūṭ], vol. 4, p. 370, # 19321

his sacred right? In the books of Shi'ah, it is written that the leadership of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, was a divine revelation from heaven, and Allah, Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala, referred to him as Amirul Mu'minin, as stated in their popular book "Al-Kafi," authored by Kulayni. Then why didn't Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, declare a religious war against them to protect his sacred revealed right? Is there any evidence that there was a war between him and those who succeeded the Prophet before him? Did he request any aid from the Ummah, as his son Hussain did when he made efforts to fight Yazid as a tyrant?

THE REPLY

This question is a modification of the previous question (12) which has been dealt with adequately. For a fact, no one can match Ali's bravery and valor. He was the finest and the most decorated soldier of Islam. Where people ran away in the battlefield, Ali is usually at the heart of the battle ground to defend the Prophet and Islam. So, it is an insult and unthoughtful statement to ask, "where is Ali's warrior-ship?" just because he refused to use the jahiliyyah style in demanding his right. Besides, what will history say, and how will history judge him if he was the first to cause civil war amongst the Muslims all because of Khilafah (leadership)? History will continue to judge Aishah, Talha, Zubayr, and Mu'awiyah for causing the greatest fitnah in Islam – the first and second civil wars. They all rebelled against Ali ibn Abi Talib under the pretense of avenging the blood of Uthman. The fitnah they stirred up led to the killing of hundreds of believers amongst who were senior and pious sahabah like Ammar ibn Yasir.

The Salafi Sheikh, Muhammad Salih al-Munajjid in one of his books writes:

The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) kept quiet about the munaafiqeen and did not execute them, even though their kufr was well-established. He bore their insults with patience, lest people say, "Muhammad is killing his companions," especially since their true nature was not known to everyone. The Prophet (peace and

blessings of Allaah be upon him) did not destroy the Ka'bah in order to rebuild it on the foundations laid by Ibraaheem, out of consideration towards Quraysh who were still new in Islam and too close to their recent jahiliyyah.[127]

Dear Professor, had Ali forcefully got his right back and in the process, Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and a host of their supporters were killed through the fiery sword of Ali, how will you judge Ali? What kind of student would Ali had been after watching for more than a decade how his master Muhammad dealt with the Munafiqeen?

Dear Professor, if you were the Prophet, you would surely have beheaded all the Munafiqeen. If you were Ali, you would surely have caused fitnah in the name of fighting for your right. Alhamdulillah, Muhammad ibn Abdullah (peace be upon him and his progeny) and Ali ibn Abi Talib (peace be upon him) weren't you.

Lastly, part of the wasiyyah of the Prophet to Ali was to remain peaceful if he could. Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents:

حدثنا: عبد الله، حدثني: محمد بن أبي بكر المقدمي، حدثنا: فضيل بن سليمان يعني النميري، حدثنا: محمد بن أبي يحيى، عن إياس بن عمرو الأسلمي، عن علي بن أبي طالب (ر)، قال: قال رسول الله (ص) إنه سيكون بعدي اختلاف أو أمر فإن استطعت أن تكون السلم فافعل.

On the authority of Ali bin Abi Talib, he said: The Messenger of God (peace be upon him) said: After me there will be a difference and a matter, and if you can be peaceful, do so.[128]

Comment: Its sanad is Sahih (authentic)

---

[127] Muhammad Salih Al-Munajjid, *The Prophet's Methods for correcting People's Mistakes*, pages 39 – 40

[128] Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Musnad (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith) [Annotator: Ahmad Muhammad Shakir], vol. 1, pg. 469, Hadith 695

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

WHY DID ALI (INITIALLY) REJECT THE KHILAFAH WHEN HE SAW THE OPPORTUNITY?

Question 14:

In the book "Nahjul Balagha," pp. 136, one of the most outstanding books for Shi'ites, it is stated that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, requested that leadership should not be given to him after Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, died. This was due to the misfortune and calamity the Ummah was facing. A coup d'état was successful, and the plotters came from Kufah; they were very few, not more than two thousand (2,000) men. However, they were allowed to carry out their mission because Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, disallowed the people from countering their attack. Finally, they launched their attack against Amirul Mu'minin (Leader of the Believers) and murdered him in his residence in the sacred city of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam.

The following was the reported request of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, as it appears in Nahjul Balagha: "Leave me alone and look for someone else; for me to be a minister to help the leader is better for you than for me to become the leader (Ameer)."

Our question to the Shi'ites here is: Why didn't he accept his right that was revealed by Allah, Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala? Is he afraid? Then who is he afraid of after Allah, Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala? If he was defeated and bullied at the initial stage, now that the chance to establish Allah's command has come, he should have used this opportunity. Or is it a fallacy regarding what you always claim about Allah's instruction?

THE REPLY

Before we quote and explain the sermon of Imam Ali in Nahj al-Balagha which the Professor referred to (adding his own imagination), it is necessary to reveal the truth to the killing of the third Caliph Uthman ibn Affan. As usual our professor was economical with the truth and fabricated narration wilfully or unknowingly to adorn and advance his polemic argument.

The Caliph, Uthman ibn Affan was killed by no other than the sahabah themselves. The reasons the Ahlu Sunnah scholars have always tried to cover the real killers of Uthman ibn Affan is to first, protect their belief in the righteousness of all the sahabah and maintain their preaching of imaginary world of harmony and fraternity between the sahabah. Second reason is to cover the unimaginable level of corruption and oppression of Uthmanic government.

First, the fact that killers of Uthman were the sahabah, the Sunni ace Imām Ibn 'Abd al-Barr writes about one of them:

عبد الرحمن بن عديس البلوي مصري شهد الحديبية ذكر أسد ابن موسى عن ابن لهيعة عن يزيد بن أبي حبيب قال كان عبد الرحمن بن عديس البلوي ممن بايع تحت الشجرة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال أبو عمر هو كان الأمير على الجيش القادمين من مصر إلى المدينة الذين حصروا عثمان وقتلوه.

'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays al-Balawī al-Misrī: He witnessed al-Hudaybiyyah.

Asad b. Mūsā mentioned from Ibn Lahī'ah, from Yazīd

b. Abī Habīb, who said: "Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays al-Balawī was one of those who gave bay'ah to the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, under the Tree". Abū 'Umar said, "He was the COMMANDER of the army that came

from Egypt to Madīnah, the army that besieged 'Uthmān AND MURDERED HIM."[129]

Imām Ibn al-Athīr also states:

عبد الرحمن بن عديس ابن عمرو بن عبيد بن كلاب بن دهمان بن غنم بن هميم بن ذهل بن هني بن بلي كذا نسبه ابن منده وأبو نعيم وهو بلوي له صحبة وشهد بيعة الرضوان وبايع فيها وكان أمير الجيش القادمين من مصر لحصر عثمان ابن عفان رضي الله عنه لما قتلوه

'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays ... He was a Sahābī, and he witnessed the bay'ah of al-Ridwān, and gave the bay'ah there. HE WAS THE COMMANDER OF THE ARMY that came from Egypt to besiege 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, may Allāh be pleased with him, WHEN THEY MURDERED HIM.[130]

This evidence yet again exposed the flaws of our professor's scholarship who knew nothing about his own Sunni sect but has the audacity to challenge Shi'i madhhab.

Why was Caliph Uthman Ibn Affan killed?

Imam Nasai documents:

أخبرني هلال بن العلاء بن هلال قال حدثنا حسين قال حدثنا زهير عن أبي إسحاق عن العلاء بن عرار قال سألت عبد الله بن عمر قلت ألا تحدثني عن علي وعثمان قال أما علي فهذا بيته من بيت

---

[129] Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr, *al-Isti'āb fi Ma'rifah al-Sahābah* (Beirut: Dār al-Jayl; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Alī Muhammad al-Bajāwe], vol. 2, p. 840, # 1437

[130] Ibn al-'Athīr, *Usd al-Ghabah fi Ma'rifah al-Sahābah* (Beirut: Dār IHyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī; 1st edition, 1417 H) [annotator: 'Ādil Ahmad al-Rufā'ī], vol. 3, p. 488-489

رسول الله ولا أحدثك عنه بغيره وأما عثمان فإنه أذنب يوم أحد ذنبا عظيما فعفى الله عنه وأذنب فيكم ذنبا صغيرا

Hilal ibn al-Ala ibn Hilli narrated from Husayn (ibn Ayyash) from Zuhayr (ibn Muawiya) from Abu Is'haq that al-Ala ibn Erar said:

Once I asked Abdullah ibn Umar 'Would you talk to me about Ali and Uthman?' He said 'As for Ali, this is his house (close position) to the messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and I do not need to talk to you about anything else. But as for Uthman, on the Day of Uhud, he committed a great sin and Allah forgave him and then he committed among you a small sin and you killed him.[131]

The big question is what was the nature of Uthman's "small" sin that made the sahabah turn against him to the extent of killing him?

Imam Jarir al-Tabari documents in his monumental book of Islamic history the final conversation between Mu'awiyah ibn Hudayj and Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr [a sahabi of the Prophet, half brother of Aishah and son of the first Caliph Abu Bakr] during the civil war. Imam Tabari documents his words when he was apprehended and was about to be executed:

'Mu'awiyah said to him, "I am only slaying you in retaliation for [the death of] Uthman." Muhammad asked him, "What have you got to do with Uthman? He [Uthman] acted unjustly and rejected the authority [hukm] of the Quran, and God has said, 'They who do not judge with what God has revealed, they are the iniquitous." We held that against him and killed him, but you give him merit for it, you and those who are like you. God has absolved us – God willing – from his sin [dhanb], but you

---

[131] Sunan al-Kubra [Muasasah ar-Risalah, Beirut, Lebanon] (Footnote: Dr. Abdullah ibn Abdul Muhsin At-Turki), part 7, page 446, hadith No. 8436

share in his offense (ithm) and the enormity of his sin, and the one who uses you [i.e Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan] is just the same."[132]

It is important to note that Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr was Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib's governor in Egypt. What was Ali ibn Talib's assessment of Uthman's killing?

Imam Jarir Tabari again documents:

According to Abu Mikhnaf – Sulayman b. Abi Rashid al-Azdi – Abd al-Rahman b. Ubayd Abu al-Kunud: Mu'awiyah [ibn Abi Sufyan] sent Habib b. Maslamah al-Fihri, Shurahbil b. al-Simt, and Ma'n b. Yazid b. al-Akhnas to Ali [ibn Abi Talib]. They went in unto him, I being present. Habib praised God and exotolled Him and then said: "Uthman b. Affan, may God be pleased with him, was a caliph guided by God, who acted according to the Book of God and constantly busied himself with God's commands. You found his life a burden and could not wait for his death, and so you attacked and killed him. If you claim that you did not, then hand over to us the killers of Uthman so that we can kill them in recompense. Then relinquish authority over the people...

'Ali b. Abi Talib said to him, "Who are you, you wretch, to tell me to relinquish authority? ...

Shurahbil b. al-Simt, said, "If I were to say anything to you, by my life it would just be like what my companion has said. Do you have any answer other than that which you gave him?" Ali said, "Yes, for you and your companion (i.e Ma'n) I have a different answer. He praised God and extolled Him, and then said:

"God sent Muhammad with the truth and through him provided deliverance from error, salvation from destruction, and the overcoming of division. Then God

---

[132] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 17, pp.158 (The first civil war – The Events of the Year 38).

took him to Himself after he had carried out his mission. The people appointed Abu Bakr as Caliph, and Abu Bakr appointed Umar after him, and those two conducted themselves well and led the community with justice. We resented their ruling over us, the family of the Messenger of God, but we excused them for that. Then Uthman ruled and did things that the people found reprehensible, so that they came to him and killed him..."[133]

Imam Jarir Tabari continues:

Shurahbil and Ma'n both said, "Testify that 'Uthman was killed unjustly." 'Ali, however, answered, "I will not say either that he was killed unjustly or that his killing was justified, because he was unjust himself." They replied, "Whoever does not assert that 'Uthman was killed unjustly, we dissociate ourselves from him," and they got up and left..."[134]

Apart from the fabrications of our professor that "a coup d'etat by plotters from Kufah" led to the killing of Uthman, other lies that certain Sunni scholars used to spoonfeed their gullible followers with is that a jewish origin Abdullah ibn saba was the one who mobilised people from Egypt and created dissensions and chaos among the sahabah that led to the killings of Caliph Uthman.

In summary, Uthman was killed by the sahabah because of his unjust ruling and rejection of Allah's ruling. Here's not an appropriate space to bring examples of unjust rulings of Uthman ibn Affan, and his blatant opposition to the rule of Allah.

Now to the main question of our professor: why did Ali first reject the khilafah when it was offered to him after the death of Uthman?

---

[133] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 17, pp.24 – 25 (The first civil war – The Events of the Year 37).

[134] Ibid, pp. 26.

In the opinion of our Professor, since Shia claimed that the khilafah was Ali's right from the onset and that he was denied of it, he should have taken it immediately without hesitation when the opportunity presented itself following the killing of Uthman. What a thought?!

Imam Jarir Tabari documents [continuation of the abovementioned speech of Ali to Shurahbil b. al-Simt and Ma'n]:

"... Then 'Uthman ruled and did things that the people found reprehensible, so that they came to him and killed him. Afterward they came to me, who was keeping out of their concerns, and they asked me to accept the oath of allegiance. I refused, but they insisted and said that the community would never find anyone acceptable but me and that, if I did not, they were afraid that division would result. So, I accepted the oath of allegiance from them. But then I was surprised to find the dissension of two of those who had given me the oath of allegiance..."[135]

Similar version of this speech is recorded in Nahj al-Balagha [sermon 227]:

"You drew out my hand towards you for allegiance but I held it back and you stretched it but I contracted it. Then you crowded over me as the thirsty camels crowd on the watering cisterns ..."

Why does Ali refuse the Khilafah at first offer having known the reason he accepted it later?

First, we need to keep in mind the Prophet's advice to Ali Ibn Abi Talib to be patient that "the Ummah will betray him after his demise". What trust did this Ummah have left in them after betraying Ali and gave continuous bay'a (oath of allegiance) to others than Ali for 23 years?

Second, why would Ali jump to the seat of authority over those who did not even want him (except for a very few)?

---

[135] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 17, pp.24 – 25 (The first civil war – The Events of the Year 37).

And interestingly, hardly did Ali assume the authority when Talha and Zubayr who had earlier given him oath of allegiance broke their oath and mobilised people in rebellion against the new Caliph. Ali knew this Ummah inside out. He was right to refuse. In sermon 135 of Nahj al-Balagha, Imam Ali reveals:

"Your allegiance to me was not without thinking, nor is my and your position the same. I seek you for Allah's sake but you seek me for your own benefits..."

For a leader to succeed, majority of his people must sincerely accept him. Many of the Prophets of Allah were not successful in their mission because their people rejected them or the majority plotted against them. Some were even murdered by their people. Yet, none of them imposed themselves on their people. Those who wished to be guided humbled themselves. The essense of ruling is to guide as Allah says, "And We have made them Imams to guide by Our command..."[136] and the Prophet has said, "O 'Ali, you are the guide. After me, the rightly guided ones will become guided through you."[137] Allah and His Messenger made Ali ibn Abi Talib the Imam over the Ummah even if the Ummah reject him.

Ali doesn't need the Ummah or the seat of authority before he could discharge his divine leadership responsibility. Rather, it was the Ummah and the seat of authority that need Ali. Therefore, Ali's initial rejection was as a result of the Ummah's insincerity, and he needed them to affirm their readiness. Yet, the Ummah later messed up Ali's government after they plagued it with three (3) civil wars and rebellions just within the space of four years. They

---

[136] Surah al-Anbiyah: 73

[137] Tafsir Imam Tabari, under verse 7 of surah ar-Rad; https://library.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?idfrom=2732&idto=2732&bk_no=50&ID=2748 ; Also, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, Fath al-Bahr fih sharh sahih al-Bukhari, vol. 8 pp. 376; hhtp://islamport.com/w/srh/Web/2747/4613.htm

never stopped until Ali and his loyal companions were killed.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

AL-HASAN'S FAMILY TREE AND LEADERSHIP

Question 15:

Why did you exclude the family of Al-Hassan from leadership but establish it for the family of Hussain? Why is it that all your Imams (leaders) are from Hussain's lineage? Why was the family of Al-Hassan not included? Does this not support the accusation against you that it is because Hussain is an in-law to Chosroes, the king of Persia, that you give him and his lineage high esteem due to their blood relation with Chosroes, who was the leader and king of fire worshippers?

Historical sources show that when Persia was conquered during the reign of Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, the daughter of Chosroes, the king of Persia, was taken captive; her name was Shaharbanu. Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, then showered his favor on Hussain, Radiyallahu Anhu, by giving him that princess as a gift. All the children of Hussain are from his union with this slave girl, the daughter of the king of Persia (Iran).

Considering how paganism and pagans were against Islam, coupled with the fact that Islam succeeded in conquering and destroying their religion (paganism) and their kingdom built by their forefathers, this triggered them to establish Shi'ism. The religion was built on a connection to the household of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam; however, its real image is linked to their yardstick: the king of Persia.

If you disagree with this assertion, then we need an explanation of what distinguishes and elevates the image of Al-Hussain above that of Al-Hassan, as reported in your

books. Among others are: "Tanqihul Maqal" by Mamqani (3/142), "A'ayunus Shi'ah" (1/26), "Biharul Anwar" (27/212), and "Kitabus Sulaimi ibn Qais," pp. 288.

THE REPLY

Unfortunately, the only rational question here is, "why is it that all your (Imams) leaders are from Hussain's lineage? Why was the family of Al-Hassan not included?" The rest of our professor's submissions are not worthy to be dignified with reply but we will briefly say few things on them.

First, if Persia was once fire worshipper nation and Muslim conquered it, then how's that a case? Arabian Peninsula was once idol worship region and Islam "conquered" it. If the fact that the daughter of "fire-worship" Persian king married to Imam al-Husein ibn Ali after the Muslim conquest of Persia and that this noble lady bore children that became the lineage of the Shi'a Imams, then what is the hollabaloo there? Prophet himself married the daughter of a non-believer and avowed enemy of Islam – Abu Sufyan who later claimed to have converted to Islam. He (peace be upon him and his progeny) also married a Jewess and a Christian. All these women became Muslims and Islam dignified them. Yet, in the thought of our professor, that seemed to be stain.

Besides, where is the clear evidence that the daughter of Choesroe (the King of Persia) was a fire-worshipper? The fact that her father was a fire-worshipper is not enough to assume the daughter followed her father's idolatry religion. We read the case of the wife of Pharaoh who was a Mu'minah but had to hide her faith because of her tyrant and polytheist husband.

Second, our professor wants his audience to believe that "Shi'ism religion" which he believed to be imposter to "Islam" (in the sense of his own madhhab) was a reaction of the Persian (Iranian) to destroy "Islam" which conquered them. Hence, he says:

"...the fact that Islam succeeded to conquer and destroy their Religion (paganism), and their kingdom that was built by their fore fathers, this triggered them to establish Shi'ism. The Religion was built by their fore fathers; this triggered them to establish Shi'ism."

Apart from the fact that there is no single evidence on this earth or in the heavens to substantiate such bogus claim fabricated by the Professor or recant from his best-selling book of fabricated history, the Professor has forgotten he has once (in his question no. 3) pegged an origin for the Shi'a different from this new entry. He says:

"Is this not a pointer that the origin of your Religion is from Jewish Religion joined with Magus (paganism), wrapped with Paganism and named Islam?"

Indeed, liars and fabricators usually have poor memories. We had academically established in our reply to question no. 4 that Shi'ism has been in existence in the Arabian Peninsula ever before the second Caliph and his forces conquered Persia. Some senior sahabah like Salman, Miqdad, Abu Dhar, Jabir, Abu Sa'id al-Khudri, Abu Tufayl et al were first set of Shi'a in terms of the core definition and beliefs of Shi'ism – the love of Ali and preferring him above other sahabah. Were these noble sahabah borrowed Jewish and fire-worship Pesian masterplan to create Shi'ism? In fact, pertaining to staunch Ali's Shi'a – Salman the Persian, the noble Prophet says:

Narrated Abu Hurairah:

Some people among the companions of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: 'O Messenger of Allah! Who are these people whom Allah mentioned, that if we turn away, they would replace us, then they would not be like us?' He said: "And Salman was beside the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), so the Messenger of Allah patted Salman's thigh and said: 'This one and his companions, and by the One in whose Hand is my soul! If

faith were suspended from Pleiades, then it would be reached by men from Persia."[138]

MAIN REPLY

Like we have observed, the only rational challenge in this part is the question: why is it that all your (Imams) leaders are from Hussain's lineage? Why was the family of Al-Hassan not included?

Before we answer this question, it is expedient to ask our Professor if he believes in the Imamah (divine leadership) of al-Hasan and al-Husein (peace be upon them both)? If the answer is "No", then what is the essence of asking a question about something you do not believe in? Of what benefit it is to him? If the answer is "Yes", then why did our professor take their avowed enemies and killers – Mu'awiyah and his son Yazid – as his leaders?

A quickest answer to the Professor's question lies in this beautiful hadith of our noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny):

Sheikh Saduq (d. 380 A. H) documents:

al-Sadooq, from his Father, from his Father, from 'Sa'ad bin Abdullah narrated to us, from Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Isa, from al-Husayn bin Saeed, from Hamaad bin Isa, from Ibrahim bin Umar al-Yamani, from abu al-Tufayl who said:

Abu Ja'far (peace be upon him) has said via his fathers that Rasool-Allah (peace be upon him and his progeny) said to Amir Al-Momineen (peace be upon him):

'Write what I dictate to you'. He (Ali) said: 'O Prophet of Allah! Do you fear my forgetfulness?' So he said: 'I do not fear forgetfulness over you, and I have supplicated to Allah for you that you would memorise and will not forget, but

---

[138] Sahih Muslim 2546 b; In-book reference : Book 44, Hadith 327; English translation : Book 31, Hadith 6178; https://sunnah.com/muslim/44/327; Tirmidhi, vol. 5 Book 44, Hadith 3260; Arabic reference; Book 47 Hadith 3569; https://sunnah.com/urn/642950

write for your associates (shurakaa'ik)'. He (Ali) said: 'And who are my associates, O Prophet of Allah?' He said: 'The Imams (peace be upon them) from your sons, whom though my community would quench itself from the rain, and whom though their supplications would be answered, and whom though Allah (swt) would remove the afflictions, and whom though the Mercy would descend from the sky, and this one is the first of them' – and he (peace be upon him and his progeny) gestured by his hand towards al-Hassan (peace be upon him), then he gestured towards al-Hussain (peace be upon him) and said: 'The Imams (as) from his sons'.[139]

قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله لأمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: اكتب ما املي عليك، فقال: يا نبي الله أتخاف علي النسيان؟ قال: لست أخاف عليك النسيان وقد دعوت الله لك أن يحفظك ولا ينسيك، ولكن اكتب لشركائك، قال: قلت: ومن شركائي يا نبي الله قال: الأئمة من ولدك، بهم تسقى أمتي الغيث، وبهم يستجاب دعاؤهم، وبهم يصرف الله عنهم البلاء ، وبهم ينزل الرحمة من السماء، وهذا أولهم وأومأ بيده إلى الحسن بن علي، ثم أومأ بيده إلى الحسين عليه السلام ثم قال: والأئمة من ولده

Grading: Sheikh Haadi al-Najafi says the chain is Good [Hasan]

FURTHER CHALLENGES

As we intend not to leave any stone unturned, there are two more points from the Professor that need clarification.

---

[139] al-Amaali al-Sadooq, Assembly 63, Hadith #1; Kamaal al-Deen, Page 119, Amali al-Toosi, Page 282; `ilal al-Sharaa'i`, Volume 1, Page 208; al-Khisal, Page 257; Bihar al-Anwar, Volume 36, Page 232 Hadith #14

First: According to the Professor, "The religion [of the Shi'a] was however established on household-ship."

Although the Professor's primary concern is "why only the lineage of al-Husein?" The fact is that even if it was only al-Hasan's lineage or both of the lineages, Salafi and Salafi wannabes' main concern is "why only the family of Ali?" Has religion's leadership been turned into family affair (household-ship, in our Prof.'s word)?

Second: Our Professor's last point is, "we need an explanation of what distinguish and make the image of Al-Hussain higher than Al-Hassan."

THE REPLY

Our Lord warns in His glorious book:

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَن يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ وَمَن يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ ضَلَالًا مُّبِينًا

"And it behoves not a believing man and a believing woman that they should have any choice in their matter when Allah and His Apostle have decided a matter; and whoever disobeys Allah and His Apostle, he surely strays off a manifest straying."[140]

Prophet Ibrahim and his lineage[141] [which by direct extension includes Prophet Muhammad and his progeny] were made Imams (divine leaders) over mankind. Likewise, Prophet Ibrahim and his lineage[142] [which by direct extension includes Prophet Muhammad and his progeny] were chosen and preferred over mankind. Was this favouritism? Absolutely No! These families were the foremost in piety, righteousness, total submission to Allah's will, and in whatever can make one near to Allah. Part of the rewards of their selfless efforts is that Allah

---

[140] Sura al-Ahzab: 36

[141] Sura al-Baqarah: 124

[142] Sura ahli-Imran: 33 – 34

preferred, chose and made them leaders over mankind. The noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) introduced his progeny as the source of guidance after him till qiyamat.

Imam Tirrmidhi further documents, Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah:

"I saw the Messenger of Allah during his Hajj, on the Day of Arafah. He was upon his camel Qaswa, giving a Khutbah, so he said: O people! Indeed, I have left over you, that which if you hold fast to it, you shall not go astray: The Book of Allah and my offspring – the ahl al-bayt"[143]

حَدَّثَنَا نَصْرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ الْكُوفِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا زَيْدُ بْنُ الْحَسَنِ، هُوَ الأَنْمَاطِيُّ عَنْ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ جَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ رَأَيْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فِي حَجَّتِهِ يَوْمَ عَرَفَةَ وَهُوَ عَلَى نَاقَتِهِ الْقَصْوَاءِ يَخْطُبُ فَسَمِعْتُهُ يَقُولُ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي قَدْ تَرَكْتُ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ أَخَذْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا كِتَابَ اللَّهِ وَعِتْرَتِي أَهْلَ بَيْتِي .

Grade: Sahih

In fact, in other version of this hadith, the Prophet golden words is, "I have left over you two khalifah ... the book of Allah and and my offspring – the ahl al-bayt."[144]

All the progeny of the noble Prophet are from no other than Ali and Fatimah. Therefore, it is Allah and His Prophet's plan and decision to monopolize the leadership of this Ummah to Ali's lineage.

The last challenge of our Professor to the Shi'a is, "we need an explanation of what distinguish and make the image of Al-Hussain higher than Al-Hassan." In other words, Shi'a

---

[143] Jami al-Tirmidhi : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3788; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4157 https://sunnah.com/urn/636710

[144] Nasir al-Din al-Albani, Sahih al-Jami al-Saghir wa Ziyadatuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islami), vol. 1, p. 482, hadith no. 2457

should explain why their reverence for al-Husein seemed to be much higher than al-Hasan, peace be upon them both. So much concern from our "loving" Professor.

Our first clarification is about their spiritual positions. The truth is al-Husein is not higher than al-Hasan nor al-Hasan higher than al-Husein. Both are Imams and Sayyid (masters) of all the youths of Paradise.

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403 H) documents:

Narrated Abd Allah, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, "Al-Hasan and Al-Husein are the Sayyid of the youths of paradise and their father is better than them both."[145]

Al-Hakim comments: The hadith is sahih with this ziyadah

And al-Dhahabi concurs: Sahih

Of course, all believers with no exception will enter paradise as youths, and al-Hasan and al-Husein are their masters, except their father whose position is loftier after the noble Prophet.

Another fact is that should their respective responsibilities were to be switched and exchanged between them, none would have discharged the responsibilities less or more than the other. Therefore, in spiritual status, they were both the same. However, the circumstances and occurences that surround Imam al-Husein's martyrdom were too emotional and draw more sympathetic attention than any of the Imams (not just Imam al-Hasan). Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, was inspired severally about the death and place of burial of al-Husein. Here we quote three ahadith out of many for brevity.

Imam Abu Ya'la documents:

---

[145] Al-Hakim al-Nayshaburi, al-Mustadrak ala as-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub Illmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H)

Narrated Anas ibn Malik: The angel of rain asked his Lord permission to visit the Prophet, peace be upon him. He gave (the angel) permission and this day he (the Prophet) was with Umm Salamah, the mother of Believers. The Prophet told her, 'Guard the door and do not let anyone come in.'

He said: "While she was at the door, Husein ibn Ali burst into the room. So the Prophet began to hug him and kiss him.

The angel said: 'Do you love him?' He said: "Yes". The angel said: "Your Ummah (nation) will kill him."

He said: "If you wish, I will show you the place in which they will kill him." So he took a handful of soil from the place in which he will be killed and he showed it. It was "Sahla" or red soil.' So Umm Salamah took it, and collected it on her clothes.

Thaabit says: "We would say that it was from Karbala.[146]

Commentator says: In Musnad Ahmad, it says, "he struck his hand and brought red sand."

Comments: The chain of narrators is good.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal also documents:

Abdullah (ibn Ahmad) - my father (Ahmad ibn Hanbal) ... Aisha or Umm Salamah...Waki says, "I can't remember which one" narrates:

The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, An angel that has never visited me before came into the house today. He (the angel) told me: This son of yours Hussein will be killed. If

---

[146] Imam Abi Ya'la Mawsili in his Musnad (Maktab Rushd: Dar al-Mamun li Turath, 1st edition, 1430 H)[annotator: Hussein Salim Asad], vol. 6, pg. 129, Hadith No.3402

you wish I can give you the soil of that earth which he will die in."[147]

He (the Prophet) said, "He then brought me a soil that was red."

Comments: The chain of narration is Sahih (authentic).

At another time, it was the archangel Jubril[148] that came to inform the Prophet.

And lastly, Imam Ahmad documents:

Narrated Ibn Abbas who said:

I saw the Prophet, peace be upon him, in my dreams during mid-day and he was dusty and disheveled. He was holding a bottle which contains blood or he was collecting something. I said: O Messenger of Allah, what is that?

He said: The blood of Al-Hussein and his companions and I have been collecting it since day-time.'

Ammar said: We memorized this day and we found out he (Al-Hussein) was killed on that day."[149]

Sheik al-Ar'naut says: The chain of narration is strong according to the conditions set by Muslim.

Of course, the historical accounts leading to the gruesome killing of al-Husein, members of his family and

---

[147] Imam Ahmad (d. 241 H) in his *Fadha'il Sahabah* (Umm al-Qura University, Makkah Mukaramah, Ibn Jawzi publication, 3rd edition, 1426 H) [annotator: Wasiyullah ibn Muhammad Abbas], vol. 2, pg.965, #1357

[148] See the hadith in our reply to question four. Besides, a late chapter also address the mourning of al-Husein in a greater length.

[149] Musnad [annotator: Shuaib al-Ar'naut and Adil Murshid], volume 4, page 59 and 336; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya [annotator: Dr. Abdullah Abdul Muhsin al-Turki] (Publisher: A'alam Al-kutub Institutions), volume II, page 573

companions at the plain of kar'bala (by those who the Professor constantly pray for, honor and took as source of guidance) is far beyond what this book can delve into. Prophet himself started this Huseini awareness and "sympathetic attention" – crying, mourning and keeping his soil – and that made al-Husein's "image" (in the word of the Professor) higher than al-Hasan's or any of the Imams for that matter. Peace be upon them all.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

GHAYBAH OF IMAM AL-MAHDI

Question 16:

It is a fact that your 12th leader (Mahdi) has hidden himself in a cave for over a thousand years. What is the reason for this? In Iraq, there is a special day when the Shi'ites gather to cry and seek his quick emergence, believing that he will save the Ummah. He is a Messiah who will protect the Ummah against tyrants! There are some new scholastic opinions, mostly found on the Internet, suggesting that the spread of vices should be encouraged because it will hasten the emergence of Mahdi.

From the outset, why did he hide himself? It's a fact that the fear of tyrant leaders during the Abbasid era was the reason for his disappearance. Then why didn't he appear after the downfall of that empire? The Shi'ites later established new governments/kingdoms such as the Ubaidiyyah and subsequent authorities like the Fatimiyyah, Buwaihiyyah, and Safawiyyah. Even in our present time, we have the Iranian Republic, which possesses nuclear weapons of mass destruction. How can we believe that the Mahdi, who fears tyrants, can fight against tyranny for the Ummah?

Question 17:

It was reported that during the birth of your acclaimed Mahdi, some birds came from heavens and were playing with their feathers and surpassing on him, they were touching his face and head and flying away, this was their routine acts. When his father was told, he smiled and replied; it was the Angels that came to have good fortune with him, and when he will acquire leadership, they are his helpers.

Our question here is if the Angels are his helpmates, then why should he disappear and hide, who then does he fear?

THE REPLY

Indeed, we only have one question here since question 17 is a repetition of question 16 in another version. Of course, the tales by moonlight story of birds from heavens playing with their feathers and so on is yet another bogus story of our professor from his bag of imagination. It neither has a source nor authenticity; therefore, it is of no probative value. Also, the concocted claim that certain "scholastic opinions" encouraged the practices of evil and vices to facilitate the reappearance of Imam al-Mahdi deserves no comment. These claims are desperate attempt by the Professor to give his question sympathy. The main question is: what is the reason for the "hiding" of Imam al-Mahdi over a thousand of years?

However, before we reply this question, we need to clarify that both Sunni and Shi'a are expecting Imam al-Mahdi from the ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet, from Fatima's descendants.[150] And we both believe his mission is to come and establish Allah's kingdom on earth whereby he will fill the earth with justice and equity as it will be filled with injustice and oppression.[151]

The points of difference are:

- Sunni believes al-Mahdi will be of al-Hasan's descendants and that his father's name will be Abdullah just like his grandfather, the holy Prophet Muhammad ibn Abdillah. Shi'a on the other hand believes he is Huseini, that is, of the lineage of al-Husein and his father was al-Hasan ibn Ali al-Askari, the Shi'a 11th Imam.

---

[150] Sunan Abi Dawud 4284; In-book reference: Book 38, Hadith 6; English translation: Book 37, Hadith 4271; https//www.sunnah.com/abudawud/38/6

[151] Sunan Abi Dawud 4283; In-book reference: Book 38, Hadith 5; English translation: Book 37, Hadith 4270; https//www.sunnah.com/abudawud/38/5

- Sunni believes al-Mahdi will be born when his mission is about to starts whereas Shi'a believes he was born over a thousand year ago and presently in occultation (ghaybah).

The interesting fact is that there is no authentic Ahlu Sunnah (Sunni) riwayah (narration) – not even one – to substantiate their two claims. All the Sunni narrations on their two claims about Mahdi are fabrications (mawdoo).[152]

THOSE IN GHAYBAH (OCCULTATION)

Some Ahlu Sunnah in their fanatical opposition to the Shi'a pretend and portray ghaybah as strange reality. Hence, in a rather "mocking" manner, our professor tried to pull a staunt saying, "It is a fact that your 12th leader (Mahdi) has hidden himself in a cave for over a thousand years..."

It is a clear fact from Quranic and ahadith perspectives that certain individuals including non-human are in ghaybah. Ghaybah is to be alive in concealment, hidden from people's sight. Then, whenever Allah wills, such individual will come out to perform his task.

Imam Ahmad documents:

عن أبي الطفيل عن حذيفة بن أسيد الغفاري قال أشرف علينا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من غرفة و نحن نتذاكر الساعة فقال لا تقوم الساعة حتى ترون عشر آيات طلوع الشمش من مغربها والدخان والدابة وخروج يأجوج ومأجوج وخروج عيسى بن مريم والدجال ...

[152] For detail exposition of all Sunni ahadith regarding this, read the book, "Imam al-Mahdi – The Twelfth Khalifah in the Sahih Sunni Ahadith" by Late Toyib Olawuyi. The book is available online.

'Abd Allāh (b. Aḥmad) – my father (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal) – 'Abd alRaḥman b. Mahdī – Sufyān – Furāt – Abū al-Ṭufayl – Ḥudhayfah b. Usayd al-Ghiffārī:

The Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, came out to us from a room while we were discussing the Hour. Then, he said, "The Hour will not be established until you have seen ten signs: the appearance of the sun from its west, the smoke, the creature, the COMING OUT of Yājūj and Mājūj, the COMING OUT of 'Īsā b. Maryam, and (coming out of) the Dajjāl..."[153]

Shaykh Shu'ayb al-Arnaut says: Its chain is sahih

All the individuals (or creatures) mentioned in this hadith have been in concealment (ghaybah – occultation) for thousands of years. And they will only come out when Allah wills. If this is the case, then what is the strangeness and hollabaloo in al-Mahdi's concealment and coming out towards the end of the worlds?

Imam al-Hakim documents:

عن أبي سعيد الخدري رضي الله عنه أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: يخرج في آخر أمتي المهدي

Abū al-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Maḥbūbī – Sa'īd b. Mas'ūd – al-Naḍr b. Shumayl – Sulaymān b. 'Ubayd – Abū al-Ṣiddīq al-Nājī – Abū Sa'īd al-Khudri (radiy'Allah anhu):

The Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, said, "The Mahdī will COME OUT at the end of my Ummah.[154]

---

[153] Abū 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal al-Shaybānī, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muasassat Qurṭubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnāūṭ], vol. 4, p. 7, # 16189

[154] Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak 'alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-

Al-Ḥākim comments: This ḥadīth has a ṣaḥīḥ chain. Imām al-Dhahabī (d. 748 H) also agrees: Ṣaḥīḥ

If al-Mahdi will COME OUT at the end of this Ummah just like 'Isa b. Maryam and Dajjal will COME OUT, it is a clear indication that he is in ghaybah (occultation) just like 'Isa b. Maryam and Dajjal. One wonders the bogus idea of Ahlu Sunnah that he will be born by an unknown Abdullah at the end of the worlds!

REASON FOR GHAYBAH

CASE ONE:

Why does the noble Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him and his progeny) went into "ghaybah (occultation)," that is, hidden (in the word of our Professor) for three days inside a cave on his escape to Madina? The "hidden" was so concealed that the murderous enemies of the Prophet had to give up trailing him. Prophet only CAME OUT of the cave when he was doubly sure the danger was over otherwise the "hidden" would have been much longer. What was the reason for the Prophet's minor and brief occultation? Allah refer to this in His glorious book thus:

And when those who disbelieve plotted against you (O Muḥammad) to imprison you, or to kill you, or to drive you out. They plot, but Allāh (too) plots (against them); and Allāh is the Best of plotters.[155]

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir writes on this verse:

'During the year of the Hijrah, the pagans tried to kill, imprison or expel him (i.e the Prophet). So, he ESCAPED with his friend and companion, Abū Bakr b. Abī Quḥāfah, to the Thawr Cave. They remained in there for THREE DAYS. So, the scouts who were sent in their pursuit returned, and they proceeded to Madīnah.'83

'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā], vol. 4, p. 601, # 8673

[155] Surah al-Anfal: 30

In the case of al-Mahdi's occultation, our dear Professor mockingly asked, "Our question here is if the Angels are his helpmates, then why should he disappear and hide, who then does he fear?"

We humbly ask our professor and people of the same weak thought like him that, "if Allah and His angels were Prophet's helpers, why should he and Abu Bakr disappear and hide themselves, who did they fear?"

CASE TWO:

The assassination and crucification plot of Prophet 'Isa ibn Maryam was highlighted in the holy Quran to the fact that Allah's intervention saved him. Our Lord says:

"...and they (the enemies) killed him ('Isa) not for sure. Nay! Allah took him up to Himself; and Allah is Mighty, Wise"[156]

And we have affirmed from abovementioned hadith that 'Isa will only COME OUT of his ghaybah at the end of the world. Again, we ask our professor: Why can't 'Isa b. Maryam come out of his "hidden" now? After all those that plotted his killing then were no more.

It is crystal clear that in both cases mentioned, had there not been for ghaybah protection process, Hazrat 'Isa and Hazrat Muhammad (peace be upon them both) would have been killed.

It is a grave mistake and silly thought to think that evil cannot befall the Prophets of Allah. In fact, many Prophets[157] including Prophet Yahya and his father Prophet Zakariyyah were murdered coldblooded by their enemies.

---

[156] Abū al-Fidā Ismā'īl b. 'Umar b. Kathīr al-Qurashī al-Dimashqī, *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Aẓīm* (Dār al-Ṭaybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī'; 2nd edition, 1420 H) [annotator: Sāmī b. Muḥammad Salāmah], vol. 4, p. 155

[157] Surah an-Nisa: 157 – 158; Surah al-Baqarah: 87; Surah al-Maidah: 70 etc

CASE THREE:

The case of Imam al-Mahdi (peace be upon him) is the most delicate case. Ever since the demise of the noble Prophet, there had been serious persecution of his family. Ali ibn Abi Talib was assassinated. Hasan b. Ali was poisoned. Husein b. Ali together with his family members and companions were gruesomely murdered. None of the Imams of Prophet's ahl al-Bayt died a natural death. They were either killed or poisoned.

The "generous" Professor suggested that "Shi'a" Mahdi should have COME OUT of "hidden" ever since the fall of Abbasid Empire et al, and that today is even safer for him with the power assumption of "armed nuclear weapon" Shi'a Iran.[158]

The mission of al-Mahdi is to come and establish Allah's kingdom on earth. This will only be done until he filled the earth with justice and equity as it will be filled with injustice and oppression meaning he will have to eradicte all the world superpowers with their modern sophisticated and nuclear weapons. This is one big enemy.

Another potential enemy of Imam al-Mahdi is the Muslims themselves. In fact, this seems to be the most dreaded enemy. If Imam al-Mahdi should COME OUT today and declares himself to be the last Caliph of the twelve (12) Imams from the ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet – a declaration that is par with the Shi'a Imamiyah ideology, it is obvious vast majority of the Sunni will vehemently oppose him and the extremists among them will plot his assassination. Other faiths will also oppose him as a result

---

[158] For a fact, there is absolutely no evidence that Iran has a nuclear weapon. IAEA has clarified this several times but the enemies of Iran continue to use such gimmick to start a war with Iran just like they deceived the world in the case of Iraq. Full reports of IAEA monitoring of Iran nuclear program from 2003 till 2020 can be read here: https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iran/iaea-and-iran-iaea-reports

of his relation with Islam. The noble Prophet himself experienced this kind of situation when the polytheists, the people of the book and the munafiqun (the hypocrites) teamed up in the battle of Khandaq (or Ahzab) against him. Al-Mahdi's mission is global, and only his Lord will design a perfect strategy for his success. We believe the Shi'a Iran is a step to that divine strategy. Yet, only Allah knows when it is the right time for him to COME OUT of his occultation.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

AL-MAHDI'S IMPORTANCE TO THE UMMAH

Question 18:

It is reported in your books that the life of Mahdi was prolonged because of the immense need the Ummah has for him, as mentioned in the book "Minhajul Karamah" by bin Mutahhir. Our question here is: If there is any being whose prestige could warrant the prolongation of his life, then why wasn't the life of the Noble Prophet prolonged? Is it that, in your creed, Mahdi is more valuable and important than the Prophet, or that the Ummah needs him more?

THE REPLY

There is absolutely no doubt about the divine mission of al-Mahdi. His great grandfather the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) summed the magnanimity and importance of his mission in this beautiful summary:

The Prophet said: If only one day of this time (world) remained, Allah would raise up a man from my Ahl al-Bayt who would fill this earth with justice as it has been filled with oppression.

Grade: Sahih (Al-Albani)

Interestingly, the Ahlu Sunnah also believe in the second coming of Prophet 'Isa b. Maryam at the end of the world. However, in the evaluation of our professor who simply cannot rationalise the essence of these individual prolonged age, he thought they must have been more valuable and more important than the holy Prophet Muhammad who lived a shorter blessed life. The Professor share nearly a similar thought with the Christians who are of the opinion that Jesus Christ is more valuable than the Prophet of Islam, the fact that he was mentioned 25 times

by name in the noble Quran compare to 5 times that the noble Prophet of Islam was mentioned.[159]

Apart from the fact that the Professor did not take into consideration Allah's perfect plan and selection of each of His servants for a particular task at a particular period, he also failed to realise that what gives grade in the sight of Allah is the level of piety and not long life. Our professor thought living a long life is what is more important.

Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him and his progeny) is the Imam and role model of all the pious servants of Allah including Ali, al-Hasan, al-Husein and al-Mahdi, or whoever for that matter. Muhammad Rasulullah is Sayyid al-Bashar (Master of mankind) and Imam al-Mursaleen (leader of Messengers of Allah).

On the other hand, his mission on earth was the most important of all missions and he was sent at the best time, and he completed his mission perfectly to the fact that it will last till eternity. Indeed, what makes a man is his legacy. Had it not been for Muhammad and Islam, al-Mahdi would never exist not to mention of accomplishing a divine task at the end of this world. The accomplishment of Al-Mahdi's task will rest totally on Islam established by his forefather the Prophet and he will serve Islam. Imam Muslim documents:

It has been narrated on the authority of Jabir b. Samura that the Prophet (s) said:

---

[159] The noble Qur'an is primarily a communication between the holy Prophet Muhammad and his Lord; therefore, in such form of communication, there is no need of name repetition. However, aside different titles and nicknames in which the noble Prophet Muhammad was called with, he was also addressed more with *subject* pronouns. Therefore, he was mentioned more than anyone.

عَنْ جَابِرِ، بْنِ سَمُرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلي الله عليه وسلم لاَ يَزَالُ هَذَا الأَمْرُ عَزِيزًا إِلَى اثْنَىْ عَشَرَ خَلِيفَةً.

This order [Islam] will continue to be dominant until there have been twelve Khalifah…

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

'ILM AL-GHAYB (UNSEEN KNOWLEDGE) OF THE IMAMS

Question 19:

It is your (Shi'ites) creed that your 12 Imams, including Hassan and Hussein, all have knowledge of the unseen and do not die until they wish to die. This is what is reported in your most authentic book, Al-Kafi. Then why did Hussain take himself to death? Why did Al-Hassan eat poisoned food? If he has knowledge of the unseen, how could he eat poisoned food? Did he commit suicide? We know that the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, said: "Whoever commits suicide will dwell in hellfire." Are you trying to say that Al-Hassan committed suicide after he knew there was poison and still ate the poisoned food?

THE REPLY

This is one of the best-selling allegations against the Shi'a by their antagonists and enemies. It is no surprise that our amiable professor also bought it. The antagonists provoke the innocent mind of their gullible followers and raise unnecessary tension with this allegation in particular. They (Shi'a antagonists) usually start with, "you claimed your Imams have the unseen knowledge" then, they will put a flavor to it saying, "...and they don't die until they so wish to die." This allegation is like a stone wrapped with a chocolate wrapper to deceive a child.

Our Lord informs us in His glorious book about 'ilm al-ghayb when He says:

عَالِمُ الْغَيْبِ فَلَا يُظْهِرُ عَلَىٰ غَيْبِهِ أَحَدًا

The Knower of the unseen! So, He does not reveal His secrets to any,

إِلَّا مَنِ ارْتَضَىٰ مِن رَّسُولٍ فَإِنَّهُ يَسْلُكُ مِن بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَمِنْ خَلْفِهِ رَصَدًا

Except to him whom He chooses as an apostle; for surely, He makes a guard to march before him and after him[160]

If this is the case about the unseen knowledge, then what is the position of the Imams from the Prophet's ahl al-Bayt? Sheikh Kulayni documents:

عِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِنَا عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عِيسَى عَنْ مُعَمَّرِ بْنِ خَلَّادٍ قَالَ

سَأَلَ أَبَا الْحَسَنِ(عليه السلام) رَجُلٌ مِنْ أَهْلِ فَارِسَ فَقَالَ لَهُ أَ تَعْلَمُونَ الْغَيْبَ فَقَالَ قَالَ أَبُو جَعْفَرٍ(عليه السلام) يُبْسَطُ لَنَا الْعِلْمُ فَنَعْلَمُ وَ يُقْبَضُ عَنَّا فَلَا نَعْلَمُ وَ قَالَ سِرّ اللهِ عَزَّ وَ جَلَّ أَسَرَّهُ إِلَى جَبْرَئِيلَ(عليه السلام) وَ أَسَرَّهُ جَبْرَئِيلُ إِلَى مُحَمَّدٍ(صلى الله عليه و آله وسلم) وَ أَسَرَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَى مَنْ شَاءَ اللهُ

A number of our people has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn 'Isa from Mu'ammar ibn Khallad who has said that a man from Persia asked abu al-Hassan (peace be upon him) the following. "Do you know al-Ghayb (the hidden facts)?" The Imam (peace be upon him) said, "abu Ja'far (peace be upon him) has said, 'It opens to us then we know it and it is withheld from us then we do not know." The Imam (peace be upon him) then said, "It is the secret of Allah, the Most Holy, the Most High, who has secretly given to Jibril and Jibril has secretly given to Muhammad (peace be upon him and his progeny) and Muhammad

[160] Surah Al-Jinn, Verse 26 – 27

(peace be upon him and his progeny) has secretly given to whoever Allah wished."[161]

So, the Imams had no independent unseen knowledge except what Allah grants them through His Messenger, their father and forefather (peace be upon them all)?! Then why is it being propagated as if they have independent knowledge of the unseen? Propaganda or sheer ignorance it is; since many of these antagonists have never even read any of the Shi'i books, they only rely on hearsays and spread it polemically. What about the time of their death? And do they die "...until they so wish tot die?"

There is no doubt that time of one's death is part of 'ilm al-ghayb known exclusively to Allah, and He reveals it to "...whom He chooses as an apostle."

Hence, whatever the Imams knew of the time of their respective death is what had been gifted to them by their fathers and forefathers via the Messenger of Allah. The claim that the Imams die when they so wish and that why can't they avoid their death is beautifully explained through series of ahadith. Sheikh Kulayni in his al-Kafi under the chapter, "The Imams knows when they will die and they die voluntarily" documents the following ahadith:

عَلِيّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ سَهْلِ بْنِ زِيَادٍ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْحَمِيدِ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ الْجَهْمِ قَالَ

قُلْتُ لِلرِّضَا(عليه السلام) إِنّ أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ(عليه السلام) قَدْ عَرَفَ قَاتِلَهُ وَ اللَّيْلَةَ الّتِي يُقْتَلُ فِيهَا وَ الْمَوْضِعَ الّذِي يُقْتَلُ فِيهِ وَ قَوْلُهُ لَمّا سَمِعَ صِيَاحَ الْإِوَزّ فِي الدّارِ صَوَائِحُ تَتْبَعُهَا نَوَائِحُ وَ قَوْلُ أُمّ كُلْثُومٍ لَوْ صَلّيْتَ اللَّيْلَةَ دَاخِلَ الدّارِ وَ أَمَرْتَ غَيْرَكَ يُصَلّي بِالنّاسِ فَأَبَى عَلَيْهَا وَ

---

161 Muhammad b. Yaqub Kulayni, kitab al-Kafi (Beirut edition), Kitāb al-Hujjah – book about people of divine authority, chapter 45 hadith #1

كَثُرَ دُخُولُهُ وَ خُرُوجُهُ تِلْكَ اللَّيْلَةَ بِلَا سِلَاحٍ وَ قَدْ عَرَفَ(عليه السلام) أَنَّ ابْنَ مُلْجَمٍ لَعَنَهُ اللهُ قَاتِلُهُ بِالسَّيْفِ كَانَ هَذَا مِمَّا لَمْ يَجُزْ تَعَرُّضُهُ فَقَالَ ذَلِكَ كَانَ وَ لَكِنَّهُ خُيِّرَ فِي تِلْكَ اللَّيْلَةِ لِتَمْضِيَ مَقَادِيرُ اللهِ عَزَّ وَ جَلَّ

Ali ibn Muhammad has narrated from Sahl ibn Ziyad from Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Hamid from al-Hassan ibn al-Jahm who has said that he said to al-Rida (peace be upon him) the following. "Amir al- Mu'minin Ali (peace be upon him) knew his assassin, the night in which he will be murdered and the spot where he will be murdered. It is his words on hearing the ducks at the house, "These are the quacks that will be followed by lamentations."

Also the words of 'Umm Kulthum (his daughter), "Would that you pray inside the house and send someone else to lead the prayer in the Mosque." He refused to do so and at that night he went many times out of the house unarmed. He knew that ibn Muljim, may he be condemned will murder him with a sword. He must not have exposed himself to it" The Imam (peace be upon him) said, "It is true but it was chosen that night wherein the measure and the determination of Allah, the Most Holy, the Most High would come to pass."[162]

Sheikh Kulayni further documents:

عِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِنَا عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ عَلِيِّ بْنِ الْحَكَمِ عَنْ سَيْفِ بْنِ عَمِيرَةَ عَنْ عَبْدِ الْمَلِكِ بْنِ أَعْيَنَ

عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ(عليه السلام) قَالَ أَنْزَلَ اللهُ تَعَالَى النَّصْرَ عَلَى الْحُسَيْنِ(عليه السلام) حَتَّى كَانَ مَا بَيْنَ السَّمَاءِ وَ الْأَرْضِ ثُمَّ خُيِّرَ النَّصْرَ أَوْ لِقَاءَ اللهِ فَاخْتَارَ لِقَاءَ اللهِ تَعَالَى

---

[162] Muhammad b. Yaqub Kulayni, kitab al-Kafi (Beirut edition), book about people of divine authority, chapter 47 hadith #8

A number of our companions has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad from Ali ibn al-Hakam from Sayf ibn 'Umayra from 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yan from abu Ja'far (peace be upon him) who has said the following.

Allah, the Most Holy, the Most High, sent support for Imam al-Husayn (peace be upon him) up to the fill between the heavens and earth. Then he was let to choose either victory or meeting Allah. He, however, chose the meeting of Allah the most High.[163]

This last statement [Then he was let to choose either victory or meeting Allah. He, however, chose the meeting of Allah the most High] is what the Shi'a antagonists interpreted as "...they don't die until they so wish to die." We say, "la haola wala quwata illah billah."

FURTHER STUDY:

Death of the Prophet and his beloved daughter, Fatima

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated`Aisha:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) in his fatal illness, called his daughter Fatima and told her a secret because of which she started weeping. Then he called her and told her another secret, and she started laughing. When I asked her about that, she replied, The Prophet (peace be upon him) told me that he would die in his fatal illness, and so I wept, but then he secretly told me that from amongst his family, I would be the first to join him, and so I laughed.[164]

---

[163] Muhammad b. Yaqub Kulayni, kitab al-Kafi (Beirut edition), book about people of divine authority, chapter 47 hadith #4

[164] Sahih al-Bukhari 3625, 3626; In-book reference: Book 61, Hadith 130USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 4, Book 56, Hadith 820. https://sunnah.com/bukhari/61/130

حَدَّثَنِي يَحْيَى بْنُ قَزَعَةَ، حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ عُرْوَةَ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ ـ رضى الله عنها ـ قَالَتْ دَعَا النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَاطِمَةَ ابْنَتَهُ فِي شَكْوَاهُ الَّذِي قُبِضَ فِيهِ، فَسَارَّهَا بِشَىْءٍ فَبَكَتْ، ثُمَّ دَعَاهَا، فَسَارَّهَا فَضَحِكَتْ، قَالَتْ فَسَأَلْتُهَا عَنْ ذَلِكَ. فَقَالَتْ سَارَّنِي النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَأَخْبَرَنِي أَنَّهُ يُقْبَضُ فِي وَجَعِهِ الَّذِي تُوُفِّيَ فِيهِ فَبَكَيْتُ، ثُمَّ سَارَّنِي فَأَخْبَرَنِي أَنِّي أَوَّلُ أَهْلِ بَيْتِهِ أَتْبَعُهُ فَضَحِكْتُ.

Was this not 'ilm al-Ghayb being given to Bibi Fatima (peace be upon her)? Here, the noble Prophet revealed the unseen, the hidden knowledge of his death and that of Fatima to her. And indeed, the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) revealed lots of secrets to his ahl al-Bayt.

Lastly, Ali ibn Abi Taalib made a grand claim of having unseen knowledge. Obviously, that is from the secret his master, Muhammad, peace be upon him and his household, entrusted him with.

The Sunni grand Imam, 'Abd al-Razzaq records:

عبد الرزاق عن معمر عن وهب بن عبد الله عن أبي الطفيل قال شهدت عليا وهو يخطب وهو يقول سلوني فوالله لا تسألوني عن شئ يكون إلى يوم القيامة إلا حدثتكم به وسلوني عن كتاب الله فوالله ما من آية إلا وأنا أعلم بليل نزلت أم بنهار أم في سهل أم في جبل

'Abd al-Razzaq – Ma'mar – Wahb b. 'Abd Allah – Abu al-Tufayl:

I witnessed 'Ali while he was delivering a sermon and saying, "Ask me! I swear by Allah, you will not ask me about ANYTHING that will occur up till the Day of Resurrection except that I will inform you of it. Ask me about the Book of Allah. I swear by Allah, there is NOT a single verse except that I know whether it was revealed

during the night or during the day, or on a level land or on a mountain.[165]

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani declares all the narrators[166] of this hadith as Thiqah (trustworthy) aside Abu al-Tufayl was a Sahabi. Therefore, the hadith is authentic. Interestingly, it was the Prophet that first made this statement.

Imam Ahmad documents:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا بن أبي عدي عن حميد عن أنس قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لا تسألوني عن شيء إلى يوم القيامة إلا حدثتكم قال فقال عبد الله بن حذافة يا رسول الله من أبي قال أبوك حذافة

Abd Allāh (b. Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) – Ibn Abi 'Adi – Hamid – Anas: The Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, said, "You will not ask me about ANYTHING (that will occur) up till the Day of Resurrection except that I will tell you." So, 'Abd Allāh b. Hudhafah said, "O Messenger of Allah, who is my father?" He replied, "Your father is Hudhafah.[167]

Shaykh al-Arnaut: Its chain is sahih upon the standard of the two Shaykhs

---

[165] Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-Ṣana'ani, Tafsir al-Qur'an (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd; 1st edition, 1410 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Muslim Muhammad], vol. 3, p. 241

[166] Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, *Taqrib al-Tahdhib* (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415H)[annotator: Mustafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, pg. 599, No. 4078; vol. 2, pg. 202, No. 6833 & vol. 2, pg. 292, No. 7505.

[167] Abu Abd Allāh Ahmad bin Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaūt], vol. 3, pg. 107, #12063

CHAPTER NINETEEN

INFALLIBILITY OF THE IMAMS: AL-HASAN VS AL-HUSEIN, WHO WAS RIGHT IN THEIR DECISONS?

Question 20:

You also acclaim the infallibility of Al-Hassan and Al-Hussain; this also applies to the rest of your 12 leaders. This is the consensus of your scholars and is evidenced in your books, among which are Ikmaluddeen by Saduq, Aqidatul Imamiyyah by Muzaffar, and Hukumatul Islamiyyah by Khomeini.

Our question is: between these two infallibles, who is right? Is it Al-Hassan or Al-Hussain? Al-Hassan, without any duress, gave the mantle of authority to Banu Umayyah; he passed it over to Muawiyah. Al-Hussain made an attempt to reclaim that leadership, which led to his assassination. Who among them acted correctly?

We should be aware of the fact that when Al-Hassan relinquished this authority, thousands of followers were answerable to him and were ready to surrender their lives for his safety; he was already the leader. Al-Hussain had in his camp only his household and some blood relatives, numbering no more than seventy, mainly women and children. Some of those who noticed their weakness left and ran away. Those who faced the army and fought with him were not more than fifty. Yet he still insisted on accomplishing his aim.

Who is on the right path between them? Is it the one who has thousands of soldiers and willingly surrenders the mantle of authority to Banu Umayyah? Or is it the one who insisted on fighting Banu Umayyah without a strong army? Who is right between them?

According to Sunni creed, they are not infallible, and Al-Hassan is more right because the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, praised him and what he did when he was giving good news about future events. He said: "This my grandson is a leader, and one day he will be an arbiter between two Muslims though they fight each other; this is because it is a war of misunderstanding, not a war against belief (creed)." Hussain was wrong in disregarding the advice given to him by observers; destiny led him to miscalculations because fighting an established government (incumbent) while trusting the Shi'ites—who never stand by their words—is simply an act of fate. The Shi'ites had previously assassinated Ali and Al-Hassan, Radiyallahu Anhu.

Before Hussain, Radiyallahu Anhu, was assassinated, he had given up and realized that the Shi'ites had plotted against him. He then presented three options: to return to Madinah, to proceed and fight alongside Muslim warriors, or to surrender himself to Yazid and pledge allegiance to him. Some Muslims, including some of his household and companions, concurred with the last option. They denied him access to any of these options as an individual. This led him to fight against the government but not as a rebel. Our wish and hope were for him to be a martyr, and his assassins should expect Allah's anger and wrath if they do not repent. The martyrdom of Hussain is a blessing that Allah bestowed upon him as He did upon his brother Al-Hassan; this elevation honors them and enables them to attain their established destiny as stated by our Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam: they are the youth leaders of Paradise.

Before the death of the Noble Prophet, they were children; none of them witnessed any religious war. However, through their assassination, Allah granted them an honor that had slipped away from them.

This is our creed as Sunnis, and we await your answers as Shi'ites regarding who is right and wrong between them.

THE REPLY

There were three vital points here brought together to carve out the main question. Apart from the concocted story and incomprehension of our professor, it is expedient to shed light on those three points while the main question is being answered along the line. These three points are as follow:

1. Issue of infallibility of al-Hasan and al-Husein (and the ahl al-Bayt altogether)
2. Abdication of power by al-Hasan to Mu'awiyah, willingly or by circumstances?
3. Al-Husein's rise against Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah

In the thought of the Professor, Imam al-Husein was wrong to "rebel" against an "established government" of Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah compared to his elder brother Imam al-Hasan who "willingly" abdicated the seat of authority to Mu'awiyah. His question is: how could the Shi'a claim they were both masoom (infallible) when one "miscalculated" and got himself together with his family members and companions killed, and the other who did the right thing by relinquished the seat of authority?

INFALLIBILITY OF AL-HASAN AND AL-HUSEIN

First, we need to define what Shi'a meant by 'isma – infallibility whereby each of the Imams of the ahl a-Bayt is known as masoom – infallible. It is important to know that each and everytime these two words are used in connection with the Imams, our antagonists and critics always advance a cheap point to win public sympathy by saying, "nobody is infallible, only Allah is; and Prophet says all the sons of Adam are liable to errors; even the noble Prophet himself made mistakes and sinned only for him to be corrected by Allah. Therefore, how can you ascribe divinity (infallibility) to your Imams?"

Second, infallibility is not divinity. In fact, it is inappropriate to think that Allah's absolute infallibility is what Shi'a claim for the Prophet and the Imams. There is no comparison here; therefore, there is no further discussion on that.

What is 'isma and who is said to be masoom? The word 'isma comes from the root word (ain – saad – meem (ع ص م)) meaning "to protect, to guard, to defend." Interestingly, every individual has a certain degree and a certain type of 'isma. Hence, we avoid anything that can cause harm to us. However, in the case of the Prophet(s) and the Imams, they were protected by Allah from committing sins, from making mistakes and errors. How is this too much to comprehend?

The Shia Sheik al-Saduq (d. 380 H) documents:

المعصوم :- الإمام الصادق (ع) - لما سأله هشام عن معنى المعصوم هو الممتنع بالله من جميع محارم الله، و قال الله تبارك وتعالى: ((و من يعتصم بالله فقد هدي إلى صراط مستقيم)).

Imam al-Sadiq (peace be upon him), in reply to Hisham's question about the meaning of infallible (masoom), said, 'The infallible [Imam] is prevented by Allah from all acts which Allah has prohibited, and Allah, Blessed and most High, says: "And whoever takes isma (defence, protection) in Allah is certainly guided to a straight path."[168]

Imam an-Nasai also documents:

It was narrated from Abu Saeed that the Messenger of Allah said:

مَا بَعَثَ اللَّهُ مِنْ نَبِيٍّ وَلاَ اسْتَخْلَفَ مِنْ خَلِيفَةٍ إِلاَّ كَانَتْ لَهُ بِطَانَتَانِ بِطَانَةٌ تَأْمُرُهُ بِالْخَيْرِ وَبِطَانَةٌ تَأْمُرُهُ بِالشَّرِّ وَتَحُضُّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَالْمَعْصُومُ مَنْ عَصَمَ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

Allah never sends a prophet or appoints a Khalifah but he has two groups of advisers: A group that tells him to do good and a group that tells him to do evil and urges him to

---

[168] Abu Jafar Muhammad Ibn Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi (Sheik Saduq), *Ma'ani al-Akhbar,* p. 132, hadith no. 1

do it. And the MASOOM is the one who is protected by Allah, the Mighty and Sublime."[169]

Grade: Sahih (authentic)

Therefore, al-Hasan and al-Husein who were true khalifah and Imams at their respective periods were masoom for the fact that Allah has removed al-Rijs (all forms of blemishes, be it physical, mental and spiritual) from the ahl al-Bayt and purified them with thorough purification.

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279H) documents on "Book of virtues – Kitab al-Manaqib":

Narrated 'Umar bin Abi Salamah - the step-son of the Prophet (peace be upon him): "When these Ayat was revealed to the Prophet, [Allah only wishes to remove the Rijs from you, O ahl al-Bayt, and to purify you with a thorough purification. (Q. 33:33)] in the home of Umm Salamah, he called for Fatimah, Hasan, Husain, and wrapped him in the cloak while 'Ali was behind him, then he said: 'O Allah! These are my Ahl al-bayt, so remove the Rijs from them, and purify them with a thorough purification.' Umm Salamah said: Am I with them, O Prophet of Allah? He replied,"You are upon your place and you are upon a good thing."[170]

This proves the 'isma of al-Hasan and al-Husein from all forms of error, mistake and sin.

ABDICATION OF AL-HASAN

First, the question we need to ask ourselves is that was the noble Prophet a masoom (infallible) when he made Sulh (reconciliation) with the Mushriqeen (polytheists) at the

---

[169] Sunan an-Nasai hadith no. 4202; In-book reference: Book 39, Hadith 54
English translation: Vol. 5, Book 39, Hadith 4207. https://www.sunnah.com/nasai/39/54

[170] *Jami' at*-Tirmidhi, English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3787; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4156 www.sunnah.com/urn/736700

treaty of al-Hudaybiyyah despite the polytheists' demand to be in control? Second question is that was Prophet Haroun a Masoom when he forcibly relinquished his Khilafah (leadership) to a polytheist Saamiri in the absence of Prophet Musa? If our answer is affirmative, then why is it difficult to rationalize Imam al-Hasan's abdication of power to Mu'awiyah to save the Ummah from fitnah despite the fact that Mu'awiyah was unworthy of the seat?

Imam al-Hasan's abdication of the seat of authority to Mu'awiyah was an historical event and the record of this event from its early stages to the final stages [that is, the circumstances, the chain of events and the terms and conditions for the abdication] are documented via various historical accounts and by different historians, from earlier to late historians. Unfortunately, there are seas of contradiction in these reports. Infact, there seems to be no aspect of the event that is free of contradiction.

The summary of these reports are in two folds:

- That al-Hasan ibn Ali abdicated the seat of authority to Mu'awiyah willingly demanding a huge sum of money in his terms and conditions. Even the reports go further saying some of the leaders of the armies of al-Hasan like Qays ibn Sa'd (a truthful diehard companion of Imam Ali), Abdullah ibn Abbas (in another report Ubaydullah ibn Abbas) wrote and demand money from Mu'awiyah after seeing their leader's intention to abdicate the seat
- The other reports claimed that al-Hasan was forced by the circumstances (after 7 – 8 months in Power) to abdicate the seat; the fact that Mu'awiyah, a very dirty politician used money and spread of propaganda to distrupt and divid the camp of al-Hasan leaving him with handful of soldiers. And when it became crystal clear that such battle is suicidal, and instead of wasting people's lives for seat of authority, al-Hasan had to abdicate the seat with stringent conditions which Mu'awiyah accepted and then violated after assuming power.

A good researcher and truth seeker is saddled with the responsibility of collating all these differing reports [of Zuhri, Awana, Abu Mikhnaf, Abu A'tham, Abu'l Faraj, Mada'ini who were primary sources of various historians like Tabari, Baladhuri, Ibn Abi'l Hadid, Ibn Abd al-Barr, Ibn al-Athir and others) and critically examine them one after the other. Such critical look is too much for this present work.

However, the question remains why did Imam Al-Hasan relinquish authority to corrupt Mu'awiyah? Both Sunni and Shi'ah document accounts that harmonized one another on this. For example, the Sunni ace historian Al-Baladhuri (d. 279 H) documents:

قالوا: ولما أراد الحسن المسير من المدائن إِلَى الْكُوفَةِ- حين جاءه ابْن عامر، وَابْن سمرة بكتاب الصلح وقد أعطاه منه مُعَاوِيَة مَا أراد- خطب فَقَالَ فِي خطبته: «فَعَسى أَنْ تَكْرَهُوا شَيْئاً وَيَجْعَلَ اللَّهُ فِيهِ خَيْراً كَثِيراً» وسار إِلَى الْكُوفَةِ. فلقي مُعَاوِيَة بالْكُوفَة، فبايعه وبايعه عَمْرو بْن سلمة الْهَمْدَانِيّ، فَقَالَ لَهُ معاوية: يا حسن- أو يا (أ) با مُحَمَّد- قم فاعتذر!!! فأبي فأقسم عَلَيْهِ، فقام فحمد اللَّه وأثنى عَلَيْهِ ثُمَّ قَالَ: [«إن أكيس الكيس التقى، وأحمق الحمق الفجور.]

أيها النَّاس انكم لو طلبتم بين جابلق وجابرس رجلا جده رَسُول اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مَا وجدتموه غيري وغير أخي الْحُسَيْن، وإن الله قد هداكم بأولنا مُحَمَّد، وإن معاوية نازعني حقا هو لي فتركته لصلاح الأمة وحقن دمائها، وقد بايعتموني عَلَى أن تسالموا من سالمت، وقد رأيت أن أسالمه وقد بايعته، ورأيت أن مَا حقن الدماء خير مما سفكها، وأردت صلاحكم وأن يكون مَا صنعت حجة عَلَى من كَانَ يتمنى هَذَا الأمر، «وَإِنْ أَدْرِي لَعَلَّهُ فِتْنَةٌ لَكُمْ وَمَتاعٌ إِلى حِينٍ» . ثُمَّ سكت وتفرق النَّاس.

... When Hasan intended to travel from al-Mada'in to Kufa after receiving the letter of reconciliation brought to him by Ibn Aamir and Ibn Sumra—where Muawiyah had agreed to his terms—Hasan delivered a sermon. In his sermon, he said:

"Perhaps you dislike something while Allah places much good in it" [Quran 2:216]. He then set out for Kufa, where he met Muawiyah. Hasan pledged allegiance to him, as did Amr ibn Salama al-Hamdani.

Muawiyah said to Hasan: "O Hasan—or Abu Muhammad—stand and apologize."

Hasan refused, but Muawiyah insisted and swore upon him. Hasan then stood, praised Allah, and said: "The wisest wisdom is piety, and the greatest folly is immorality."

O people, if you were to search from Jabulqa to Jabrasa for a man whose grandfather is the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), you would find no one but me and my brother Husayn. Allah guided you through our forefather Muhammad (peace be upon him).

Now, Muawiyah has disputed with me over a right that belongs to me. I have relinquished it for the sake of the unity of the Ummah and to prevent its bloodshed. You had pledged allegiance to me to make peace with whomever I made peace, and I have decided to make peace with him.

I have pledged allegiance to him because I have deemed preserving bloodshed better than causing it. I desired your well-being and to make what I did a proof against those who aspired for this matter (caliphate).

'And I do not know; perhaps it is a trial for you and an enjoyment for a while' [Quran 21:111]."

Then he remained silent, and the people dispersed.'[171]

---

[171] Ahmad ibn Yahya Al-Baladhuri, *Ansab al-Ashraf* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr), vol. 3, pg. 287 - 288.

Also, another Sunni historian and biographer, Ibn Al-Athīr (d. 630 H) documents:

ذكر خروج الخوارج علي معاوية

قد ذكرنا فيما تقدم اعتزال فروة بن نوفل الأشجعي في خمسمائة من الخوارج ومسيرهم إلى شهرزور وتركوا قتال علي والحسن فلما سلم الأمر الحسن الأمر إلى معاوية قالوا قد جاء الآن ما لا شك فيه فسيروا إلى معاوية فجاهدوه فأقبلوا وعليهم فروة بن نوفل حتى حلوا بالنخيلة عند الكوفة وكان الحسن بن علي قد سار يريد المدينة فكتب إليه معاوية يدعوه إلى قتال فروة فلحقه رسوله بالقادسية أو قريبا منها فلم يرجع وكتب إلى معاوية لو آثرت أقاتل أحدا من أهل القبلة لبدأت بقتالك فإني تركتك لصلاح الأمة وحقن دمائها .

Mention of the Rebellion of the Kharijites Against Mu'awiya

We have previously mentioned the withdrawal of Furwah ibn Nawfal al-Ashja'i, along with five hundred Kharijites, and their movement toward Shahrazur. They refrained from fighting against Ali and Hasan. However, when Hasan relinquished authority to Mu'awiya, they declared, "Now the matter has become certain." They decided to march against Mu'awiya to wage jihad against him. Under the leadership of Furwah ibn Nawfal, they proceeded until they camped at al-Nukhaylah near Kufa.

At this time, Hasan ibn Ali was heading toward Medina. Mu'awiya wrote to him, urging him to fight against Furwah. Mu'awiya's messenger caught up with Hasan at al-Qadisiyyah or nearby, but Hasan did not turn back. Instead, he wrote to Mu'awiya, saying, "If I preferred to fight anyone from among the people of the Qiblah

(Muslims), I would have started with you. I left you for the sake of the unity of the ummah and to spare its blood."[172]

Yet, quoting the Professor, he wants us to believe that, "Al-Hassan without any duress gave Banu Umayyad the mantle of authority given to him; he passed it over to Muawiyah."

Imam Al-Tabari also documents Imam al-Hasan's speech when he was about to leave. He writes:

"When peace was made between al-Hasan and Mu'awiyah at Maskin, [al-Hasan] rose – as I have been told on the authority of Ziyad al-Bakkai – Awanah – to speak to the people, saying, "O people of Iraq, I am glad to be rid of you for three reasons: your killing of my father, your stabbing of me, and your plundering of my posssessions." Then al-Hasan, al-Husein, and Abdallah b. Jafar left with their servants and baggage and went to al-Kūfah. When al-Hasan arrived there, having recovered from his wounds, he went out to the mosque of al-Kūfah and said, "O people of al-Kūfah, be God-fearing toward your neighbors and guests and toward the members of your Prophet's ahl al-Bayt, from whom Allah removed sinfulness and whom He purified completely." And the people began to weep. Then they departed for al-Madinah."[173]

Those were the attitude of the then Muslim community and yet, our professor said, "We should be aware of the fact that when Al-Hasan gave out this authority, thousands of followers are answerable to him, and were ready to surrender their lives for his safety, he was already the leader."

---

[172] Ibn Athīr, Al-Kāmil fī Al-Tārikh (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Arabi) [annotator: Dr. 'Umar Abdul-Salām], vol. 3, pg. 9.

[173] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901) (Between civil wars, the Caliphate of Mu'awiyah – The Events of the Year 41), volume 18, pp. 11

Mu'awiyah never stopped being a rebel and menace. His father Abu Sufyan was an avowed enemy of Islam; he plotted all the wars and evils against the Prophet and his followers. Abu Sufyan only accepted Islam "forcefully" when Makkah was conquered a year and few months to the death of the Prophet. His son, Mu'awiyah accepted Islam after the conquest of Makkah and the surrendering of his beloved father. It is however not surprising that after embezzling Muslim funds and amassed wealth and power (being the governor of Syria) during the reign of his cousin Caliph Uthman; he had the audacity to wage war against Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib campaigning under the guise of avenging Uthman's murder. After the assassination of Imam Ali and assumption of al-Hasan to Power, Mu'awiyah rose again to fight for the seat of authority exposing his lies that he fought Ali to avenge Uthman. He never cared about people's lives or Islamic state.

As crystal clear as the reason of Al-Hasan's abdication is, a misconception usually arise as to why Imam al-Hasan used to collect "gifts" from Mu'awiyah afterward? It is argued that it signifies mutual ties and true reconciliation. No one answer this misconception better than Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal.

قال الإمام احمد، رحمه الله: ليس أحد من المسلمين إلا و له في هذه الدراهم حق، و كيف أقول: إنها سحت، و الحسن، و الحسين، عبدالله بن جعفر، و كثير من الصحابة: يقبلون جوائز معاوية؛ قال: و لأن جوائز السلطان لها وجه في الإباحة و التحليل، فإن لها جهات كثيرة من الفيء والصدقة و غيرها.

Imam Ahmad, may Allah have mercy on him, said:

There is no Muslim who does not have a right in these dirhams (public entitlement funds), and how can I say: "It is forbidden", when Al-Hasan, Al-Husein, Abdullah bin Jaafar, and many of the Companions used to accept Muawiyah's gifts?! He said: This is because the Sultan's gifts are permissible and lawful. They are (sources) from

many directions like the booty (of war), charity, and other things.[174]

In conclusion, al-Hasan was a khalifah guided by Allah in his decisions and part of this decision was his abdication of power to a thirstier and power crazy Mu'awiyah, safeguarding the lives of the Muslim community who had been ripped down with several civil unrests. Had people been faithful and steadfast with the members of their Prophet's ahl al-Bayt, Imam al-Hasan would have resisted Mu'awiyah's trouble and fight him off.

AL-HUSEIN'S RISE AGAINST YAZID IBN MU'AWIYAH

Before the death of Mu'awiyah, he had perfected and made all arrangement for his son Yazid to succeed him.

He had secured the oath of allegiance for Yazid from various Arabs' chiefs and lords via bribe or force except five people who refused to give him the oath, and the most important personality among them was al-Husein ibn Ali. After the death of Mu'awiyah and the rise of Yazid to power, there was still the need to secure al-Husein's oath of allegiance. Yazid wrote two letters to his governor Al-Walid b. Utbah in Madina one of which [with its contents] is described thus:

'He wrote to him on another parchment as small as a rat's ear: "Seize Husayn, 'Abdallah b. Umar, and Abdallah b. al-Zubayr to give the oath of allegiance. Act so fiercely that they have no chance to do anything before giving the oath of allegiance. Peace be with you."[175]

---

[174] *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah fi ajwibah al-Najdiyah* (Rasail Majmu'a Ulama' al-Najdi) [Compiler: Abdur-Rahman ibn Muhammad ibn Qaasim al-Aasimi al-Najdi], Vol. 11, section 1, pg. 327

[175] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 19, pp.2 – 3 (Caliphate of Yazid b. Mu'awiyah – The Events of the Year 60)

When the governor of Madina finally summoned al-Husein, he gathered his guards and positioned them at the gate with intrustruction that if they should hear his call or the governor's raised voice at him, they should rush together to him. Imam Al-Tabari continues:

Then al-Walid read him the letter (first letter), gave him the news of Mu'awiyah's death, and demanded the oath of allegiance from him. Al-Husayn said, "We belong to Allah and to Him we shall return ... As for the oath of allegiance which you have asked me to give, a person like me should not give his oath of allegiance in secret. I do not see that you would be satisfied with less than my public oath made before all the people."

Al-Walid agreed, and al-Husayn suggested, "When you come out before the people and summon them to give the oath of allegiance, you should summon us with the people. Then it will be one affair." Al-Walid, who preferred the easy way, said to him, "Go then in the name of God and come to us with the people." Marwan interrupted, swearing, "By God! If he leaves you now without giving the oath of allegiance, you will never have the same opportunity without much bloodshed between you and him. Hold the man, do not let him leave you until he gives the oath of allegiance or cut off his neck."

... Marwan told al-Walid, "You disobeyed me. No, by God! He will never give you the same hold over him again." Al-Walid replied, "Do not reproach me for this, O Marwan. You have advised me to do something in which there lies complete destruction and the ruin of my religion. By God, if the entire wealth and treasures of the whole world were given to me I would not kill Husayn. Should I kill him only because he refuses to pay homage, I would suffer total destruction on the Day of Judgement, for in the sight of God there cannot be anything more accountable than the blood of Husayn."[176]

---

[176] Ibid, page 4 -5

At this stage, it is clear that Yazid never got to power through the general consensus they used to claim; hence, the desperation to get oath of allegiance of important personalities of Quraysh then.

Why did al-Husein refuse to pay homage to Yazid (even if we put aside his case of the right ownership to the seat of authority)? It is imperative to introduce Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah. Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir al-Dimashqi in his al-Bidayat wa al-Nihayat documents:

ترجمة يزيد بن معاوية

وقد روي أن يزيد كان قد اشتهر بالمعازف وشرب الخمر والغناء والصيد واتخاذ الغلمان والقيان والكلاب والنطاح بين الكباش والدباب والقرود ، وما من يوم إلا يصبح فيه مخمورا ، وكان يشد القرد على فرس مسرجة بجمال ويسوق به ، ويلبس القرد قلانس الذهب ، وكذلك الغلمان ، وكان يسابق بين الخيل ، وكان إذا مات القرد حزن عليه . وقيل : إن سبب موته أنه حمل قردة وجعل ينقزها فعضته. وذكروا عنه غير ذلك . والله أعلم بصحة ذلك

The biography of Yazid ibn Mu'awiya:

It is narrated that Yazid was known for indulging in music, drinking alcohol, singing, hunting, keeping young boys, female singers, dogs, and engaging in contests between rams, bears, and monkeys. It is said that he would wake up intoxicated every day. He reportedly tied a monkey to a saddled horse with ropes, rode it, and dressed the monkey in gold caps, as well as dressing young boys similarly. He also organized horse races, and when a monkey died, he would grieve over it. It is said that his death occurred because he was carrying a monkey and making it jump

when it bit him. Other such stories are mentioned about him, though God knows best about their accuracy.[177]

This description of Yazid by Ibn Kathir was graphically explained by Abdullah Ibn Hanzala (son of famous companion of the Prophet, Hanzala ibn Abi Âmir who had the title of Ghaseel al-Malā'ika غسيل الملائكة or the one cleansed by the angels) who together with few tabi'een (followers of sahabah of the Prophet) went to Sham (Syria) to visit the "Caliph of the Muslim Ummah" – Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah. Abdullah reported on arriving in Madina what he saw:

فوالله ما خرجنا على يزيد حتى خفنا آن نرمى بالحجارة من السماء

God forbids! We went out upon Yazid until we were afraid that there would be stones raining on us from the sky (due to unIslamic scenes we witnessed).

Abdullah then gives a glimpse of what they saw:

أن رجلا ينكح الأمهات والبنات والأخوات ويشرب الخمر ويدع الصلاة

Inded, he (Yazid) was a man who was engaging in illegal sexually activity with mothers, daughters and sisters; drinking wine to stupor and neglect salat."[178]

If there are things the scholars unanimously agreed upon, the irreligiousity and waywardness of Yazid ibn

---

177 Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, *al-Bidayat wa al-Nihayat, tarjama Yazid ibn Muawiyat* – ترجمة يزيد بن معاوية https://library.islamweb.net/ar/library/index.php?page=bookcontents&ID=1040&idfrom=934&idto=934&flag=0&bk_no=59&ayano=0&surano=0&bookhad=0

178 Muhammad ibn Sa'd, *Tabaqat al-Kubra*, vol.7, *chapter, the people of Madina among the tabi'een*, page 1413 – 2302; طبقات ابن سعد - ج 7 - في أهل المدينة من التابعين - 1413 – 2302

Mu'awiyah is one of them. How can an ordinary believer not to mention al-Husein ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib give oath of allegiance to someone of this nature? Interestingly, his character and attitude are known to all even before his father secured the seat for him. Unfortunately, people including some sahabah paid allegiance to him fearing for their lives, but never the likes of al-Husein.

Al-Husein was the head of the Prophet's ahl al-Bayt at the time, his oath of allegiance to a taaghut Yazid-would be a sell out of his grandfather's 23 years efforts of establishing Islam. Not giving allegiance to Yazid though at the expense of his life will be eternal message that Muhammadan Islam stands against taaghut. Imam al-Husein gathered the rest of his family and left Madina for Makkah. Meanwhile, the people of Iraq where the seat of Islamic government was (apart from Mu'awiyah's empire in Syria) had written hundreds of letters to al-Husein calling for Imam to come and lead them in their religion.

On one hand, neither Makkah nor Madina nor anywhere else is safe for al-Husein to hide. This is because history had it that the forces of the vicious khalifah Yazid ransacked Makkah and Madinah in the battle of Harrah, destroyed the sanctity of those two holy lands. His forces raped scores of women that year after which scores of bastards were born. Yazidi forces destroyed and burnt the holy kaaba in the bid to fish out Abdullah ibn Zubayr who continued his non-recognition of Yazid as the khalifah.[179] Al-Husein knew this much because upon being advised to stay in Makkah, he told Abdullah ibn Zubayr:

My father told me, 'There will be in Makkah a ram (i.e a leader) who will cause its sanctity to be violated,' and I do not want to be that kind of ram." Another version of al-Husein's response was, "By God! I would prefer to be killed a few inches outside the sanctuary of Makkah than

---

[179] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 19, pp.221 – 227 (Caliphate of Yazid b. Mu'awiyah – The Events of the Year 64). All historians record the battle of harrah (64 Hijrah).

to be killed a few inches within it. I swear by God, even if I were in a deep snake's hole, they would pull me out in order to carry out their will. By God! They would violate me just as the Jews violated the Sabbath."[180]

On the other hand, al-Husein is duty bound as an Imam to heed the call of those in need of guidance and leadership[181] irrespective of their past attitude as traitors. He is also duty bound to oppose the taaghut Yazid and his satanic regime.

Allah says in His glorious book:

فَلَوْلَا كَانَ مِنَ الْقُرُونِ مِن قَبْلِكُمْ أُولُو بَقِيَّةٍ يَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْفَسَادِ فِي الْأَرْضِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِّمَّنْ أَنجَيْنَا مِنْهُمْ وَاتَّبَعَ الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مَا أُتْرِفُوا فِيهِ وَكَانُوا مُجْرِمِينَ

But why were there not among the generations before you those possessing understanding, who should have forbidden the making of mischief in the earth, except a few of those whom We delivered from among them? And those who were unjust went after what they are made to enjoy of plenty, and they were guilty."[182]

This is Allah's order to conscious Muslims who while there is evil, corruption and sinfulness within an Islamic society spearheaded by Muslim leader should rise against and oppose it. This should be fought and corrected verbally, and if there is need, physically.

Narrated Abu Sa'id al-Khudri:

---

[180] Ibid, pp. 69 [The kufans' invitation to Husayn and the Mission of Muslim b. Aqil]

[181] Ibid, pp. 16 onward under the title: [The kufans' invitation to Husayn and the Mission of Muslim b. Aqil]

[182] Surah Hud, Verse 116

عَنْ أَبِي سَعِيدٍ الْخُدْرِيِّ، قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم أَفْضَلُ الْجِهَادِ كَلِمَةُ عَدْلٍ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ أَوْ أَمِيرٍ جَائِرٍ

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: The best fighting (jihad) in the path of Allah is (to speak) a word of justice to an oppressive ruler.[183]

Sheikh al-Albani: Sahih (Authentic)

If this is the obligatory duty in the Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet, therefore, it behoves Imam Husein who is a true follower of the Quran and the Sunnah of Prophet to oppose such debased leader in Yazid ibn Muawiyah in his time. Seeing a supposed successor of his grandfather the Prophet destroying the fabrics of Islam that the Prophet and righteous sahabah painstakingly established for 23 years, it is incumbent upon Husein to oppose such system. Therefore, Imam Husein on his way from Makkah to Madina and to Kufa and then diversion to Karbala, at every point he keeps on declaring why he cannot keep silent. One of the best quotations from him was when he was intercepted by the army of Hur, Imam al-Husein was reported to have said:

أما بَعْدُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتُمْ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ص قَدْ قَالَ فِي حَيَاتِهِ مَنْ رَأَى سُلْطَاناً جَائِراً مُسْتَحِلًّا لِحُرُمِ اللَّهِ نَاكِثاً لِعَهْدِ اللَّهِ مُخَالِفاً لِسُنَّةِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ يَعْمَلُ فِي عِبَادِ اللَّهِ بِالْإِثْمِ وَ الْعُدْوَانِ ثُمَّ لَمْ يُغَيِّرْ بِقَوْلٍ وَ لَا فِعْلٍ كَانَ حَقِيقاً عَلَى اللَّهِ أَنْ يُدْخِلَهُ مَدْخَلَهُ

Thereafter, haven't you heard what the Prophet said? (He said): whosoever sees a tyrant and transgressing ruler who make halal what Allah has declared haram, violate the

---

[183] Sunan Abi Dawud 4344; In-book reference : Book 39, Hadith 54; English translation : Book 38, Hadith 4330 https://sunnah.com/abudawud/39/54; https://sunnah.com/nasai/39/61

covenant of Allah, opposing the sunnat of Messenger of Allah and he is aggressive and oppressive among the servants of Allah; then, did not act to change these with his voice and action (and did not show opposition and resistance), then upon Allah is the right to place him (such person who keeps silent in the face of evil) in the position (of punishment) as him (the tyrant leader)"[184]

Ubaydullah Ibn Ziyad whom Yazid had ordered to take control of Kufah had terrorized the people of kufah, killed or imprisoned the "disobedients" before al-Husein even arrived there. Al-Husein together with his family and companions had not even reached Kufah when the forces of Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah ambushed them, seiged them for 9 days, massacred them on the 10th day on the plain of Kar'bala.

Narrated Muhammad:

حَدَّثَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي حُسَيْنُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا جَرِيرٌ، عَنْ مُحَمَّدٍ، عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ أُتِيَ عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ زِيَادٍ بِرَأْسِ الْحُسَيْنِ ـ عَلَيْهِ السَّلاَم ـ فَجُعِلَ فِي طَسْتٍ، فَجَعَلَ يَنْكُتُ، وَقَالَ فِي حُسْنِهِ شَيْئًا

Anas bin Malik said, "The head of Al-Husain was brought to 'Ubaidullah bin Ziyad and was put in a tray, and then Ibn Ziyad started playing with a stick at the nose and mouth of Al-Husain's head and saying something about his handsome features. Anas then said (to him), "Al-Husain resembled the Prophet more than the others did."[185]

---

[184] Allamah Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 44, page 381 | بحار الأنوار - العلامة المجلسي - ج ٤٤ - الصفحة ٣٢٩

[185] Sahih al-Bukhari 3748; In-book reference: Book 62, Hadith 95; USC -MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 57, Hadith 91; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/62/95

Imagine Anas ibn Malik dining with Ibn Ziyad and affirming the handsomeness of Al-Hussain. In conclusion, both al-Hasan and al-Husein were super right in their respective decisions and being Allah's and His Messenger's Khulafah, they were guided by Allah in their decisions. The apparent difference in these decisions was caused by the situation and circumstance at their respective time. Al-Hasan will do exactly what al-Husein did and vice versa if their cases were to be switched.

CHAPTER TWENTY

SWIMMING IN THE POOL OF IGNORANCE

Question 21:

In the book of Al-Kafi (1/252), it was narrated; "the 12 Imams knew the day they will die and none will die unless by his will." Furthermore, in Biharul Anwar (43/366), Al-Majlisi narrated: "none of the Imams has died a natural death, its either he is assassinated or he is poisoned."

It is an established fact in our creed that whoever commits suicide will dwell in hell fire, by the narrations reported from the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi Wassalam. Therefore, when your Imams were poisoned, were they aware of it and ate the poison, or is this not suicide? Or were they ignorant of it? Or are all these stories fallacies? i.e. the narrations by Kulayni and Al-Majlisi.

THE REPLY

This question is a repetition of question 19 in another version and it has been answered (reply to question 19) under the title, 'ILM AL-GHAYB (UNSEEN KNOWLEDGE) OF THE IMAMS.

Question 22:

You persistently claim that Hussain died of thirst and narrate that he said, "Whenever you drink water,

remember me." In the states where Shi'ism is established, there are special places set up for drinking water with signs boldly stating: "Drink and remember the thirst of Hussain."

Our question is: Doesn't he have knowledge of the unseen? Isn't he aware of his thirst? Why didn't he come with enough water? Allah instructs us to carry weapons when embarking on war; how can we travel with weapons and forget about food? Go to Surah Al-Anfal, verse 60; Allah says we should make provisions if we are to go to war. Is there any better provision for someone who is liable to die on the journey than water?

Our creed is that Hussain was ignorant of what was about to happen to him, but he followed his destiny as decreed by Allah. However, you who say he has knowledge of the unseen, we await your explanations.

THE REPLY

Apart from the fact that this question is also a repetition of question 19 in another colourful version, it is perhaps the most unintelligent question so far. Following are quick facts:

- Al-Husein together with his family and companions were not going to al-kufah for battle. Somebody going to a battle will never take along his under-age children, baby, women and the sick. War was brought to him along the way to al-Kufah.
- On the point that "he should have carried enough water if truly he knew he will die thirsty:" Apart from the fact that there were no water tankers then to carry along (if that was the Professor's thought), enough provisions that will sustain their journey from Madina to al-Kufah were carried along by al-Husein. Yet, al-Husein's caravan took a route that will naturally be of advantage to their journey in terms of provisions. In addition, they were forced by the army of al-Hur b. Yazid al-Tamimi (a noble man who later joined the camp of al-Husein and

laid his life in his defence) to camp beside the river Euphrates, a 2,780 kilometer river. However, the problem was that the vicious and satanic armies sent by Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah sieged al-Husein and his people for days denying them access to water despite their pleading for water for children. At a time, they even burnt down part of al-Husein's camps destroying their properties.

This is a historical event that is generally documented, yet our professor was either ignorant of it or was economical with the truth or was overtaken by his emotion and hatred of "the Shi'a" to ask such unintelligent question.

Lastly, the uncultured Professor who swims regularly in his sea of ignorance also questioned the reward for "... remember the thirst of Hussain." Fortunately, it is not only in the Shi'a books that remembrance of al-Husein is said to attract reward or encouraged.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents this authentic hadith:

أحمد بن إسرائيل قال رأيت في كتاب أحمد بن محمد بن حنبل رحمه الله بخط يده نا اسود بن عامر أبو عبد الرحمن قثنا الربيع بن منذر عن أبيه قال : كان حسين بن علي يقول من دمعتا عيناه فينا دمعة أو قطرت عيناه فينا قطرة اثواه الله عز و جل الجنة

Narrated al-Rabi' b. Munzir:

Husayn b. 'Ali used to say: "Anyone whose eyes are filled with tears for our sake, or tears drop from his eyes for our sake, Allah the Almighty, the Most Glorious will reward him with the Paradise."[186]

Imam al-Tirmidhi also documents the peak of all reward:

---

[186] *Fadail as-Sahabah* of Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal, vol. 2, p. 675, hadith no. # 1154: http://islamport.com/w/ajz/Web/2294/1170.htm

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم حُسَيْنٌ مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْ حُسَيْنٍ أَحَبَّ اللَّهُ مَنْ أَحَبَّ حُسَيْنًا

Narrated Ya'la bin Murrah: that the Messenger of Allah said: Husain is from me, and I am from Husain. Allah loves whoever loves Husain.[187]

Grade: The hadith is Hasan (Sound)

What is the meaning of this Hadith? In this Hadith, even if we easily rationalise the fact that Imam al-Husein was the grandson of the Prophet, hence, the word "Hussein is from me," then, how do we rationalise, "and I am from Hussein"? Obviously, the Prophet is not talking about grandfather-grandson's relation in this hadith. Rather, al-Husein's thought, decisions and actions were Muhammad's and vice versa. Peace and blessing of Allah upon Muhammad and his ahl al-Bayt.

---

[187] Al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3775; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4144 https://sunnah.com/urn/636580

SHI'ISM AND THE QUR'AN

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

SHI'A AND THE QUR'AN (1)

Question 23:

The Shi'ites accuse the companions of changing the Qur'an, and many of your narrations from your authentic books confirm this. You believe that our Qur'an is fake because you accuse the companions of hiding the original Qur'an. For example, in the book of Biharul Anwar (24/305), it was reported from Abu Abdullah, Ja'far al-Sadiq, Alaihis Salam, that he said: "The Qur'an was revealed in four different categories: the first category was revealed to us (the household of the Prophet), the second category was revealed against our enemies (the companions), the third category is a combination of traditions and proverbs, and the fourth is a composition of compulsory duties and some rules of authority. All the honors and dignity of the Qur'an are revealed to us."

Imagine! A quarter of the Qur'an is a bunch of proverbs; this forms the basis of their argument against the companions, claiming that they hid the first two categories of the Qur'an. However, if you read the entire Noble Qur'an from beginning to end, there is no place where the companions are dishonored or accused; rather, it is the opposite.

Our question here is: If the companions hid some portions of the Qur'an, where is Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu? Why didn't he reveal it? Are they the only ones under obligation while Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, is not? If he did reveal it, then where? What did he disclose? Where is the new Qur'an? Produce your proof if you are truthful.

THE REPLY

Our professor has proven over time and again to be someone who cares not about verification, and of course he is academically incompetent on Sunni-Shi'i discource. His mission is just to attack Shi'a, by hook or by crook.

There are two main allegations here:

- That Shi'a accused the companions of changing the Qur'an
- That Shi'a hadith claims a quarter of the Qur'an "is bunch of proverbs"

It is one thing to make a claim and it is another thing entirely to justify and prove the claim. The Professor claimed that Shi'a accused the companions of changing the Qur'an, but his only evidence is "... and many of your narrations from your authentic books confirm that." How is this evidence? At least one reference to a sound narration in Shi'a authentic books should have been cited to give his claim a life line. Surprisingly, what our Professor brought instead is a hadith that has less or nothing to do with his claim. Yet, in a bogus manner he somehow conjoined his pathetic claim with one hadith. Here, we quote the hadith as it is documented by Allamah al-Majlisi in his monumental work "Bihar al-Anwar."

On the authority of Ibn Abbas, he said:

عن ابن عباس قال: قال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: نزل القرآن أرباعا: ربع فينا، وربع في عدونا، وربع سنن وأمثال وربع فرائض وأحكام، ولنا كرائم القرآن.

Amir al-Mu'minin (Ali ibn Abi Talib), peace be upon him said: The Qur'an was revealed in four quarters; a quarter was revealed on us (ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet), a quarter over our enemies, a quarter is traditions and parables, a quarter is obligatory duties and rulings, and for us is the most honourable of the Qur'an.[188]

CASE ONE:

---

[188] Muhammad al-Baqir al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar [Dar al-Ihya al-Thurath al-Arab, Beirut, Lebanon], volume 24, p. 305, hadith 1 and hadith 3; Chapter: *Bab Jawaami' taweel maa nazala fiheem, alayhi salam.*

The hadith in its both version in Bihar al-Anwar is from Amir al-Mu'minin Ali ibn Abi Talib, as against Abu Abdullah Jafar as-Sadiq claimed by the Professor.

CASE TWO:

The hadith says وربع في عدونا – fi aduwwina – over our enemies. Surprisingly, our Professor instead writes "... against our enemies (companions)".

CASE THREE:

The hadith says وربع سنن وأمثال – wa rabi' sunan wa amthaal –traditions and parables.

The Professor in the zenith of his ignorance writes, "Imagine!!! A quarter of the Qur'an is bunch of proverbs." The word used in the hadith is أمثال – amthaal. It is the plural of مثل – mathal, meaning parable, proverb, example, similitude etc.

The noble Quran used the word in several places when setting examples or relating stories of the past. For brevity, let us cite three examples from the glorious Qur'an.

In sura al-Baqarah:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَسْتَحْيِي أَن يَضْرِبَ مَثَلًا مَّا بَعُوضَةً فَمَا فَوْقَهَا فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَيَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِن رَّبِّهِمْ وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَيَقُولُونَ مَاذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِهَٰذَا مَثَلًا يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيرًا وَيَهْدِي بِهِ كَثِيرًا وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِينَ.

Surely Allah is not ashamed to set forth any parable-- (that of) a gnat or any thing above that; then as for those who believe, they know that it is the truth from their Lord, and as for those who disbelieve, they say: What is it that Allah means by this parable: He causes many to err by it and many He leads aright by it! But He does not cause to err by it (any) except the transgressors.[189]

---

[189] Surah Al-Baqara, Verse 26

Again, from sura al-Baqarah, we read:

مَّثَلُ الَّذِينَ يُنفِقُونَ أَمْوَالَهُمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ كَمَثَلِ حَبَّةٍ أَنبَتَتْ سَبْعَ سَنَابِلَ فِي كُلِّ سُنبُلَةٍ مِّائَةُ حَبَّةٍ وَاللَّهُ يُضَاعِفُ لِمَن يَشَاءُ وَاللَّهُ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيمٌ

The parable of those who spend their property in the way of Allah is as the parable of a grain growing seven ears (with) a hundred grains in every ear; and Allah multiplies for whom He pleases; and Allah is Ample-giving, Knowing [190]

And in sura Ibrahim, we read:

أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ ضَرَبَ اللَّهُ مَثَلًا كَلِمَةً طَيِّبَةً كَشَجَرَةٍ طَيِّبَةٍ أَصْلُهَا ثَابِتٌ وَفَرْعُهَا فِي السَّمَاءِ

Have you not considered how Allah sets forth a parable of a good word (being) like a good tree, whose root is firm and whose branches are in heaven.[191]

There are lot more parables in the glorious Qur'an. Parable is a short narrative illustrating a lesson by comparison or analogy. Unfortunately, in his sea of ignorance, "proverb" (i.e parable) is something bad and unimaginable to be in the Quran, hence his saying, "Imagine!!! A quarter of the Qur'an is bunch of proverbs." Perhaps his understanding of "proverb" is the story of rabbit and carrot.

WHO ARE THE ENEMIES OF THE AHL AL-BAYT?

The hadith under discussion revealed that a quarter of the Qur'an was revealed upon the enemies of ahl al-Bayt and the Professor interpreted "our enemies" in the hadith as "companions" of the Prophet.

We have revealed in previous chapter the Prophet's introduction of Ahl al-Bayt to be himself, Ali, Fatima, al-Hasan, al-Husein (in the hadith of cloak) and by extension

---

[190] Surah Al-Baqara, Verse 261
[191] Surah Ibrahim, Verse 24

the other Imams last of whom is al-Mahdi (in the hadith of al-Thaqalain). Therefore, who were their enemies? Of course, their enemies are the enemies of Allah and the enemies of righteous believers foremost of who were the impeccable sahabah.

The noble Qur'an categorise these enemies into three:

- The kuffar (unbelievers)
- The Munafiqun (hypocrites)
- A portion of the ahl al-Kitab (people of the book)

Apart from the fact that a surah each was revealed and named after the first two above mentioned enemies[192] , larger portion of the noble Qur'an exposed these enemies, their characteristics and evil plans. For brevity, our Lord says:

وَإِذَا رَأَيْتَهُمْ تُعْجِبُكَ أَجْسَامُهُمْ وَإِن يَقُولُوا تَسْمَعْ لِقَوْلِهِمْ كَأَنَّهُمْ خُشُبٌ مُّسَنَّدَةٌ يَحْسَبُونَ كُلَّ صَيْحَةٍ عَلَيْهِمْ هُمُ الْعَدُوُّ فَاحْذَرْهُمْ قَاتَلَهُمُ اللَّهُ أَنَّىٰ يُؤْفَكُونَ

And when you see them, their persons will please you, and If they speak, you will listen to their speech; (they are) as if they were big pieces of wood clad with garments; they think every cry to be against them. They are the enemy, therefore beware of them; may Allah destroy them, whence are they turned back?[193]

WERE THERE MUNAFIQUN FROM AMONG THE SAHABAH?

The Ahlu Sunnah (except a few) are of the stern opinion that there were no Munafiqeen (hypocrites) from among the sahabah; hence, they go by the definition of Sahabi postulated by al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani which states a sahabi is "whoever met the Prophet, and had Iman (faith) and died upon Islam." Therefore, Ahlu Sunnah's

---

[192] Sura al-Kaafiroun (chapter 109) and sura al-Munafiqun (chapter 63)

[193] Sura al-Munafiqun, verse 4

argument is that a Munafiq (hypocrite) can never be a sahabi since he is a kafir (unbeliever) in reality but only use Islam apparently to shield himself. With this argument, Ahlu Sunnah always accuse the Shi'a who believe some of the Sahabah were Munafiqeen vis-à-vis some of them were enemies of the ahl al-Bayt.

Unfortunately, the postulated definition of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani with its understanding by the Ahlu Sunnah is in serious opposition to the following realities:

- Prophetic hadith. Imam Muslim documents:

Qais reported:

I said to Ammar: What is your opinion about that which you have done in case (of your siding with Hadrat Ali)? Is it your personal opinion or something you got from Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him)? Ammar said: We have got nothing from Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) which people at large did not get, but Hudhaifa told me that Allah's Apostle (peace be upon him) had especially told him amongst his Sahabah (Companion), that there would be twelve Munafiqeen (hypocrites) out of whom eight would not get into Paradise, until a camel would be able to pass through the needle hole. The ulcer would be itself sufficient (to kill) eight. So far as four are concerned, I do not remember what Shu'ba said about them.[194]

Another group of the Sahabah was even the renegades. Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated Ibn Al-Musaiyab: The companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, the Prophet said: "Some men from my Sahabah will come to my Lake-Fount and they will be driven away from it, and I will say, O Lord, my Sahabah! It will be said, You have no knowledge of

---

[194] Sahih Muslim 2779 a; In-book reference : Book 51, Hadith 12; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 38, Hadith 6688; https://sunnah.com/muslim/51/12

what they innovated after you left: they turned apostate as renegades (reverted from Islam)[195]

حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ صَالِحٍ، حَدَّثَنَا ابْنُ وَهْبٍ، قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي يُونُسُ، عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ، أَنَّهُ كَانَ يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ أَصْحَابِ النَّبِيِّ، صلى الله عليه وسلم أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ : يَرِدُ عَلَى الْحَوْضِ رِجَالٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِي فَيُحَلَّئُونَ عَنْهُ فَأَقُولُ يَا رَبِّ أَصْحَابِي. فَيَقُولُ إِنَّكَ لاَ عِلْمَ لَكَ بِمَا أَحْدَثُوا بَعْدَكَ، إِنَّهُمُ ارْتَدُّوا عَلَى أَدْبَارِهِمُ الْقَهْقَرَى

- Quranic reality: Our Lord further exposed certain group thus:

وَمِمَّنْ حَوْلَكُم مِّنَ الْأَعْرَابِ مُنَافِقُونَ وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ مَرَدُوا عَلَى النِّفَاقِ لَا تَعْلَمُهُمْ نَحْنُ نَعْلَمُهُمْ سَنُعَذِّبُهُم مَّرَّتَيْنِ ثُمَّ يُرَدُّونَ إِلَىٰ عَذَابٍ عَظِيمٍ

And from among those who surround you of the dwellers of the desert there are hypocrites, and from among the people of Medina (also); they are stubborn in hypocrisy; you do not know them; We know them; We will chastise them twice then shall they be turned back to a grievous chastisement[196]

Of course, the people of Islamic state of Madinah were the Muhajireen and the Ansar both of whom were Sahabah. Here, Allah exposed that from amongst them were Munafiqeen par excellence. Imam Dhahabi:

كما كان جماعة في أيام النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم منتسبون إلى صحبته وإلى ملته، وهم في الباطن من مردة المنافقين، قد لا يعرفهم

---

[195] Sahih al-Bukhari 6586; In-book reference : Book 81, Hadith 174; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 8, Book 76, Hadith 586; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/81/174

[196] Surah At-Taubah, Verse 101

نبي الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، ولا يعلم بهم، قال الله تعالى: {وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ مَرَدُواْ عَلَى النِّفَاقِ لاَ تَعْلَمُهُمْ نَحْنُ نَعْلَمُهُمْ سَنُعَذِّبُهُم مَّرَّتَيْنِ} سورة التوبة 101 فإذا جاز على سيد البشر أن لا يعلم ببعض المنافقين وهم معه في المدينة سنوات، فبالأولى أن يخفى حال جماعة من المنافقين الفارغين عن دين الإسلام بعده عليه السلام على العلماء من أمته.

There were LOTS OF PEOPLE, during the days of the Prophet, peace be upon him, who were called his Sahābah and who were regarded among the followers of his religion, but who were in reality hidden hypocrites. The Prophet of Allāh, peace be upon him, did not know them, and he was NOT made to know them (by Allāh): "And so are some among the people of Madīnah who persist in hypocrisy; you (O Muhammad) know them not, We know them. We shall punish them twice". (9:101). Since it was possible for the leader of mankind NOT to know some of the hypocrites even though they were with him in Madīnah for years, then it is more permissible for the Muslim 'ulamā after him, peace be upon him, NOT to know the true status of many of the apostate hypocrites (among his Sahābah).[197]

Imam Muslim puts the last nail on the coffin. He documents:

عَنْ زِرٍّ، قَالَ قَالَ عَلِيٌّ وَالَّذِي فَلَقَ الْحَبَّةَ وَبَرَأَ النَّسَمَةَ إِنَّهُ لَعَهْدُ النَّبِيِّ الأُمِّيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم إِلَىَّ أَنْ لاَ يُحِبَّنِي إِلاَّ مُؤْمِنٌ وَلاَ يُبْغِضَنِي إِلاَّ مُنَافِقٌ

Zirr reported: Ali observed: By Him Who split up the seed and created something living, the Apostle (may peace and blessings be upon him) gave me a promise that no one but

---

[197] Abū 'Abd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Dhahabī, Siyar Alam al-Nubalā, vol. 14, p. 343

a believer would love me, and none but a Munafiq (hypocrite) would hate me.[198]

Conclusion

There is no evidence that Shi'a accused the Sahabah of changing the Qur'an, and it has been proven that there were parables in the glorious Qur'an (which according to the hadith carries a quarter of the Qur'an) and lastly, a portion (quarter, according to the hadith) of the Qur'an was truly revealed over the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt. And there is no doubt that there are lots of places for the merits of Ahl al-Bayt.[199]

---

[198] Sahih Muslim 78In-book reference : Book 1, Hadith 146USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 1, Hadith 141; https://sunnah.com/muslim/1/146

[199] For example, sura al-Ahzab, verse 33 [portion of purification], surah al-Insan etc., etc.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

SHI'A AND THE QUR'AN (2)

Question 24:

If the companions hid half or portions of the Qur'an because they hated the honor of the Prophet's household, then why didn't they hide the Prophetic traditions that reveal their honor? These traditions are evidenced in both your books and ours. At this juncture, I will not provide examples from your books (Shi'ites); I will use our (Sunni) books that are our pride.

After the Qur'an, there is no book of higher esteem and authenticity than the books of Bukhari and Muslim. Let us cite some examples from them regarding the honor of the Prophet's household: "Whoever I am his close companion, then Ali is also his close companion."

We can deduce that the entire Shi'ite creed is based on this tradition. It was reported in Bukhari by more than 20 companions. In the science of hadith, this reaches the peak of authenticity (tawatir). The companions reported it, and we believe in it; however, our argument concerns the misinterpretations given by you, the Shi'ites.

1st example... 2nd example... 3rd example:

The hadith that portrays the honor of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, and his position states: "Your position to me is like Harun's position to Musa." Harun is a junior brother to Musa, just as Ali is a junior brother to the Noble Prophet; however, the first category consists of Prophets while in the second category, Ali is not a Prophet.

4th example... 5th example...

The traditions regarding the honor and dignity of the Prophet's household—concerning their love as an obligation and hatred as a great torment—were all narrated by the companions. Why should they hide the Qur'anic verses on this and reveal the Prophetic traditions? Or does

Allah not guard the Qur'an? Why did He (Allah) guard the hadith but not give the Qur'an such protection? Let's think!

THE REPLY

Again, this is just a colourful version of the previous question. The Professor still claims the Shi'a accused the sahabah to have hide or changed the Qur'an but no evidence is provided to support this bogus claim.

What Shi'a claim is that the Qur'an manuscript of Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib is the most accurate and comprehensive in the fact that it was arranged in sequencial order of revelation, and that each verse has its own tafsir (interpretation) but the main content and commands are the same with other manuscripts of other sahabah despite their various differences in arrangement.

Allamah Fayd Kashani in his tafsir has documented Imam Ali's address to a group of Muhajireen concerning the manuscript of his own Qur'an. After mentioning its features [in terms of arrangement and interpretations], Talha b. Ubaydullah who was perplexed asked about the manuscript with the people to which Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib replies:

قال: إن أخذتم بما فيه نجوتم من النار و دخلتم الجنة فإن فيه حجتنا و بيان حقنا و فرض طاعتنا

He said: If you adhere to what (i.e the Qur'an) you have (i.e in your possession), it will save you from hell and entered you into paradise, then in it is our proof, and statement of our right, and the imposition of our obedience.[200]

And Al-Kashani has also documented in his al-Wafi the following:

Narrated Jabir:

"I heard Abu Ja'far [al-Baqir] say that no one has ever claimed that he collected the Qur'an in its entirety as it was revealed, except liar; and no one collected it and

---

[200] Fayd kashani, *as-Saafi fi Tafsir al-Qur'an*, part 1, pg. 78

memorized it as it was revealed by God, the Exalted, except Ali b. Abi Talib and the Imams who came after him."[201]

There is absolutely no doubt about different manuscripts of the Qur'an with various Sahabah who knew Qur'an. They differ in its arrangement and recitation (but never the content). These differences also spread far and wide as reported in the narration of Ibn Mahk.

Imam al-Bukhari documents this athar:

حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ مُوسَى، أَخْبَرَنَا هِشَامُ بْنُ يُوسُفَ، أَنَّ ابْنَ جُرَيْجٍ، أَخْبَرَهُمْ قَالَ وَأَخْبَرَنِي يُوسُفُ بْنُ مَاهَكَ، قَالَ إِنِّي عِنْدَ عَائِشَةَ أُمِّ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ـ رضى الله عنها ـ إِذْ جَاءَهَا عِرَاقِيٌّ فَقَالَ أَىُّ الْكَفَنِ خَيْرٌ قَالَتْ وَيْحَكَ وَمَا يَضُرُّكَ قَالَ يَا أُمَّ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَرِينِي مُصْحَفَكِ. قَالَتْ لِمَ قَالَ لَعَلِّي أُوَلِّفُ الْقُرْآنَ عَلَيْهِ فَإِنَّهُ يُقْرَأُ غَيْرَ مُؤَلَّفٍ. قَالَتْ وَمَا يَضُرُّكَ أَيَّهُ قَرَأْتَ قَبْلُ، إِنَّمَا نَزَلَ أَوَّلَ مَا نَزَلَ مِنْهُ سُورَةٌ مِنَ الْمُفَصَّلِ فِيهَا ذِكْرُ الْجَنَّةِ وَالنَّارِ حَتَّى إِذَا ثَابَ النَّاسُ إِلَى الإِسْلاَمِ نَزَلَ الْحَلاَلُ وَالْحَرَامُ، وَلَوْ نَزَلَ أَوَّلَ شَىْءٍ لاَ تَشْرَبُوا الْخَمْرَ. لَقَالُوا لاَ نَدَعُ الْخَمْرَ أَبَدًا. وَلَوْ نَزَلَ. لاَ تَزْنُوا. لَقَالُوا لاَ نَدَعُ الزِّنَا أَبَدًا. لَقَدْ نَزَلَ بِمَكَّةَ عَلَى مُحَمَّدٍ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَإِنِّي لَجَارِيَةٌ أَلْعَبُ {بَلِ السَّاعَةُ مَوْعِدُهُمْ وَالسَّاعَةُ أَدْهَى وَأَمَرُّ} وَمَا نَزَلَتْ سُورَةُ الْبَقَرَةِ وَالنِّسَاءِ إِلاَّ وَأَنَا عِنْدَهُ. قَالَ فَأَخْرَجَتْ لَهُ الْمُصْحَفَ فَأَمْلَتْ عَلَيْهِ آىَ السُّوَرِ

Narrated Yusuf bin Mahk:

While I was with Aisha, the mother of the Believers, a person from Iraq came and asked, "What type of shroud is the best?" `Aisha said, "May Allah be merciful to you! What does it matter?" He said, "O mother of the Believers!

---

[201] Fayd Kashani, *al-Wafi*, vol. 2, sec. 76, pp. 30

Show me (the copy of) your Qur'an," She said, "Why?" He said, "In order to compile and arrange the Qur'an according to it, for people recite it with its Suras not in proper order." `Aisha said, "What does it matter which part of it you read first? (Be informed) that the first thing that was revealed thereof was a Sura from Al-Mufassal, and in it was mentioned Paradise and the Fire. ...Then `Aisha took out the copy of the Qur'an for the man and dictated to him the Verses of the Suras[202]

At the end, Uthman during his Caliphate, following the manuscript written by Zayd ibn Thabit [on the order of Abu Bakr during his reign] ordered an official and unifying copy while other manuscripts were burnt, and no one faulted the Uthmanic "official and unified" Qur'an. However, if our Professor in his futile and sponsored effort to malign the Shi'a continue to make his bogus claim [without citing single evidence] that Shi'a accused the Sahabah of hidding and changing the Qur'an, we ask him to explain the following Sunni authentic athar:

- **Athar One: Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī (d. 361 H) documents:**

عن ابن عباس في هذه الآية (لا تدخلوا بيوتا غير بيوتكم حتى تستأنسوا وتسلموا على أهلها) وقال : إنما هي خطأ من الكاتب حتى تستأذنوا وتسلموا

Ibn Abī Maryam – al-Firyābī – Sufyān – Shu'bah – Ja'far b. Iyās – Mujāhid:

Ibn 'Abbās said concerning His Statement, the Almighty, the Most Glorious {You who have īmān! do not enter houses other than your own until you have asked permission [tasta-nisū] and greeted their inhabitants}

---

[202] Sahih al-Bukhari, *Kitab fadail Quran*, Chapter: The compilation of the Qur'an, hadith 4993
Sahih al-Bukhari 4993, In-book: Book 66, Hadith 15, USC-

[24:27]: "The scribes made a mistake. It is only {until you have asked permission [tasta-dhinū]}."[203]

Shaykh al-Arnaūṭ says about the report: Its chain is ṣaḥīḥ upon the standard of the two Shaykhs.

This is a clear athar ascribe to a Sahabi that Ahlu Sunnah believed was the most knowledgeable in Quran exegesis and teachings. What we have today in the Qur'an is [tasta-nisū] and not [tasta-dhinū].

We also read in Ahlu Sunnah tafasir189 that Abdullah ibn Mas'ud, another Sahabi believed by Ahlu Sunnah to have memorized and written Qur'an [i.e he was among the scribes of the Qur'an], never believed surah al-Falaq and surah an-Nas to be part of the Qur'an, and that two surah never existed in his manuscript.

- Athar Two: Imam Ahmad documents:

Abd' Allah – Muhammad b. al-Husein b. Ishkaab – Muhammad b. Abi Ubaydah b. Mahn – his father – A'mash – Abi Is'haq – Abd al-Rahman b. Yazid, he said:

عن عبد الرحمن بن يزيد، قال: كان عبد الله، يحك المعوذتين من مصاحفه، ويقول: إنهما ليستا من كتاب الله

Ibn Mas'ud erased al-mu'awwizatayn from his mushaf and said they were not part of the Qur'an[204]

Shu'aib Ar'naut: Its chain is authentic. The narrators are trustworthy.

• Athar Three: Imam Tirmidhi documents:

---

[203] Sharḥ Mushkil al-Athār (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risālah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaūṭ], vol. 4, p. 249; Also, Imam Jarir Tabari in his book of Tafsir under this verse (sura Nur: 27) also quoted this report of Ibn Abbas

[204] Ahmad bin Hanbal, al-Musnad (Beirut: ar-Resalah Publications, 2001), part 35, pages 116 – 117, Hadith 21186 and 21188

قَالَ الزُّهْرِيُّ فَأَخْبَرَنِي عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عُتْبَةَ أَنَّ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ مَسْعُودٍ كَرِهَ لِزَيْدِ بْنِ ثَابِتٍ نَسْخَ الْمَصَاحِفِ وَقَالَ يَا مَعْشَرَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ أُعْزَلُ عَنْ نَسْخِ كِتَابَةِ الْمُصْحَفِ وَيَتَوَلاَّهَا رَجُلٌ وَاللَّهِ لَقَدْ أَسْلَمْتُ وَإِنَّهُ لَفِي صُلْبِ رَجُلٍ كَافِرٍ يُرِيدُ زَيْدَ بْنَ ثَابِتٍ وَلِذَلِكَ قَالَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مَسْعُودٍ يَا أَهْلَ الْعِرَاقِ اكْتُمُوا الْمَصَاحِفَ الَّتِي عِنْدَكُمْ وَغُلُّوهَا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يَقُولُ :.

(وَمَنْ يَغْلُلْ يَأْتِ بِمَا غَلَّ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ) فَالْقُوا اللَّهَ بِالْمَصَاحِفِ . قَالَ الزُّهْرِيُّ فَبَلَغَنِي أَنَّ ذَلِكَ كَرِهَهُ مِنْ مَقَالَةِ ابْنِ مَسْعُودٍ رِجَالٌ مِنْ أَفَاضِلِ أَصْحَابِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم . قَالَ هَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ صَحِيحٌ . وَهُوَ حَدِيثُ الزُّهْرِيِّ لاَ نَعْرِفُهُ إِلاَّ مِنْ حَدِيثِهِ

Az-Zuhri said: "'Ubaidullah bin 'Abdullah bin 'Utbah informed me that 'Abdullah bin Mas'ud disliked Zaid bin Thabit copying the Musahif, and he said: 'O you Muslim people! I am removed from recording the transcription of the Mushaf and it is overseen by a man, by Allah, when I accepted Islam he was but in the loins of a disbelieving man' - meaning Zaid bin Thabit - and it was regarding this that 'Abdullah bin Mas'ud said: 'O people of Al-'Iraq! Keep the Musahif that are with you, and conceal them. For indeed Allah said: And whoever conceals something, he shall come with what he concealed on the Day of Judgement (3:161). So, meet Allah with the Musahif.'" Az-Zuhri said: "It was conveyed to me that some men amongst the most virtuous of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) disliked that view of Ibn Mas'ud.[205]

---

[205] Tirmidhi, Sunan, English reference: Vol. 5, Book 44, Hadith 3104; Arabic reference: Book 47, Hadith 3387; https://sunnah.com/urn/641130

Grade: Sahih (authentic)

Caliph Uthman never called upon senior sahabah who knew Qur'an and wrote the Prophet's manuscript of the Qur'an during his lifetime, the likes of Abdullah b. Mas'ud, Ubayy b. Ka'ab, Abdullah b. Abbas, Ali b. Abi Talib; hence, the rejection of Zaid b. Thabit by Abdullah b. Mas'ud. The grave result of this is the affirmation of error in the Uthmanic edition by yet Abdullah b. Mas'ud.

Imam Tabari in his tafsir documents:

حدثني محمد بن عمرو قال : ثنا أبوعاصم عن عيسى عن ابن أبي نجيح عن مجاهد في قوله { وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللهُ مِيثَاقَ النَّبِيِّينَ لَمَا آتَيْتُكُمْ مِنْ كِتَابٍ وَحِكْمَةٍ} قال هي خطأ من الكاتب، وهي في قراءة ابن مسعود {وإذ أخذ الله ميثاق الذين أوتوا الكتاب}

Muhammad bin Amro – Abu Asim – Isa – Ibn Abi Nujaih – Mujahid who said about the verse: "Behold! Allah took the covenant of the prophets, saying: I give you a Book and Wisdom" He said: 'It is a mistake of the scribes. In the recitation of Ibn Masud it was in this manner: "And Allah made a covenant with the people who were given the book'.[206]

- Athar Four: Imam Sa'eed ibn Mansur (d. 227 H) in his Sunan

حدثنا سعيد قال: نا إسماعيل بن إبراهيم عن أيوب عن نافع عن ابن عمر قال: لا يقولن أحدكم: أخذت القرآن كله وما يدريه ما كله قد ذهب منه قرآن كثير ولكن يقول: أخذنا ما ظهر منه.

Sa'id – Isma'il b. Ibrahim – Ayyub – Naafi:

---

[206] [A] Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabari, Jami al-Bayan an tawil ay al-Qur'an, under surah Aal Imran, ayah 81

Ibn Umar said, "Let none of you say: 'I have got the whole of the Qur'an.' How does he know what the whole of it is? A lot of the Qur'an has been lost. Instead, he should say: 'We have got what emerged of it."[207]

Dr. Sa'd Aal Humayyid comments: Its chain is authentic (Sahih)

In short, Abdullah ibn Abbas, Abdullah ibn Mas'ud and Abdullah Ibn Umar never believed in the authenticity and completeness and perfection of Uthmanic edition of the Qur'an that we have today. We can mention scores of these examples in the books of the Sunni pointing to the incompleteness and errors in the present Qur'an. So, who is actually accusing the sahabah, the Shi'a or the Sunni?

QUICK REPLY TO OTHER MISCONCEPTIONS

Our Professor while citing few ahadith on the merits of Ahl al-Bayt (peace be upon them) state the following:

---

[207] Sa'eed Ibn Mansour, *Sunan* (Dar al-Sami'i Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 1st Ed. 1414 H) [annotator: Dr. Sa'd b. Abd Allah b. Abd al-Aziz Aal Humayyid], vol. 2, p. 432, Hadith 140.

First misconception:

After the Qur'an, there is no any book of high esteem and authenticity than the books of Bukhari and Muslim. Let us bring some example from them as regards the honor of the Prophet household: "Whoever I am his close inmate then Aliyu is also his close inmate." We can deduce that the whole Shi'ites creed is based on this tradition. It was reported in Bukhari by more than 20 companions

First, Shi'a never believed in ANY book other than the Qur'an to be authentic unlike the Sunni who believe the entirety of sahih al-Bukhari and sahih Muslim to be authentic. And how can these books be 100% authentic when there are lots of errors, mistakes and fabrications in them? Let us quickly cite few examples:

Prophet Musa running naked until people saw his private part:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet (s) said, 'The (people of) Bani Israel used to take bath naked (all together) looking at each other. The Prophet (peace be upon him) Moses used to take a bath alone. They said, 'By Allah! Nothing prevents Moses from taking a bath with us except that he has a scrotal hernia. So once Moses went out to take a bath and put his clothes over a stone and then that stone ran away with his clothes. Moses followed that stone saying, "My clothes, O stone! My clothes, O stone! till the people of Bani Israel saw him and said, 'By Allah, Moses has got no defect in his body. Moses took his clothes and began to beat the stone." Abu Huraira added, "By Allah! There are still six or seven marks present on the stone from that excessive beating."[208]

Mahmud – 'Abd al-Razzaq – Ma'mar – Ibn Tawus – his father – Abu Hurayrah:

---

[208] Sahih al-Bukhari 278; In-book reference: Book 5, Hadith 30; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 1, Book 5, Hadith 277; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/5/30

Sulayman b. Dawud, peace be upon them both, said: "Tonight, I will go around to ONE HUNDRED WOMEN. Each woman will give birth to a boy who will fight in the Cause of Allah." The angel said to him: "Say 'insha Allah.'" But, he did not say it, and he was caused to forget. Then, he went round to them, and none of them gave birth to a child except one woman, who gave birth to a malformed child...."[209]

Obviously, these are Biblical fabrications against the Prophets of Allah. Yet, in the weirdest thought of Ahlu Sunnah, since these were documented in Sahihayn, they are all authentic.

- Monkey commited adultery and was stoned by fellow monkies.[210]
- The bogus claim that the noble Prophet of Islam went to Meeraj before his Prophethood.[211]

Of course, there are lot more of other examples.

Second, about the polemic and erroroneous translation and interpretation of hadith Ghadir by the Professor, "Whoever I am his close inmate then Aliyu is also his close inmate."

Prophet's true declaration was, "man kuntu mawla fa Aliyy mawla – of whosoever I am his mawla, Ali is his mawla." We have beyond reasonable doubt proved and provided evidences from the context in which this sentence was used in Prophetic hadith, Quranic verses and even saying of Ahlu Sunnah scholar that the word "mawla" means "someone with authority over the believers,

---

[209] Sahih al-Bukhari 2819; In-book reference: Book 56, Hadith 35; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 4, Book 52, Hadith 74; http://sunnah.com/bukhari/56/35

[210] Sahih al-Bukhari 3849; In-book reference: Book 63, Hadith 75USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 58, Hadith 188; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/63/75

[211] Sahih al-Bukhari 7517; In-book reference : Book 97, Hadith 142; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 9, Book 93, Hadith 608; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/97/142

someone in charge of affairs of the believer."[212] Unfortunately, the Ahlu Sunnah (except for a few) wants to fool the world that Prophet's use of "mawla" only meant "friend, close intimate" as the professor also claimed.

Third, the Professor also claimed that hadith al-Ghadir was reported by Bukhari. He says, "We can deduce that the whole Shi'ites creed is based on this tradition. It was reported in Bukhari." The hadith is never in Bukhari's Sahih unless the Professor meant the book of tarikh (history) of al-Bukhari.

Second misconception:

3rd example:

The hadith that portray the honor of Ali Radiyallahu Anhu and his position, it says; "Your position to me is like Harun's position to Musa." Harun was a junior brother to Musa likewise Ali a junior brother to the Noble Prophet, but the first category are Prophets while in the second category Ali is not a Prophet.

First, Prophet Haroun was older than Prophet Musa yet the Professor erroroneously said, "Harun was a junior brother to Musa." There is no controversy whatsoever amongst the scholars that Haroun was older.

Imam al-Tabari for example documents:

Narrated al-Qasim who said: Al-Husein – Hajaaj – ibn Jurayj – Ibn Abbas:

كان هارون أكبر من موسى Haroun was older than Musa[213]

Apart from the fact that Haroun was older, he also died during the lifetime of Musa. The Professor sank into this error in his attempt to downplay the merit of this hadith.

---

[212] Refer to the reply of question 1 under the title, "Meaning of Mawla"

[213] Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabari, Jami al-Bayan an tawil ay al-Qur'an, under surah Taha, ayah 30

Prophet is not talking about older, younger position in this hadith; rather, he is talking about the spiritual position of Haroun to Musa vis-à-vis Ali to himself. According to Qur'an, Haroun was Musa's (spiritual) brother, minister, helper and associate in the deen, khalifah (successor).[214]

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

SHI'A AND THE QUR'AN (3)

Question 25:

It is an established fact that the companions of the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, narrated and reported the Qur'an directly from the Prophet. The chain of narration for the Qur'an is (Mutawatir), meaning it is the peak of all chains in the study of transmission. We have ten different narrations of the Qur'anic recitations, with two schools from each recitation, and all the narrators are Sunnis.

In the present world, three recitations are the most prominent: Nafi'u, Asim, and Abu Amr al-Basri. The recitation of Nafi'u is well-known through his two schools, Warsh and Qalun; the recitation of Asim is transmitted through the school of Hafs, while the recitation of Abu Amr al-Basri is transmitted through the school of Duri. All printed copies of the Qur'an, even in Iran, are based on one of these recitations; that is, most published and printed copies use the recitation of Hafs, which is narrated from Asim, from Abu Abdurrahman As-Sulami, from Uthman bin Affan, Ali bin Abi Talib, Zaid bin Thabit, and Ubayy bin Ka'ab.

Our question is: Where does the Prophetic household narrate the Qur'an? Where is your chain from Ali bin Abi Talib? What about the chain from Al-Hassan, Al-Hussain,

---

[214] Refer to the reply of question 6 under the cited hadith 3

and Zainul Abidin? Where is the chain from Ridha to Kazim, to Sadiq, and to Baqir? What about Askari from Naqiyyu and Taqiyyu?

Are they not your claims as natural-born leaders and Allah's plea against His creatures? Did they teach everything except for the Qur'an? Why should you refer to unbelievers' narrations (as you claim)? Research has proven that there is only one Qur'anic narration of recitation from the Prophetic household, which is the recitation of Hamza Az-Zayyat (Sunni), narrated from Sadiq, from Baqir, and from Zainul Abidin. Where is the Shi'ite narration of this recitation? Why is it that Zayyat, a Sunni scholar, is the only narrator and reporter? Why didn't Kazim narrate from Sadiq? Or Askari from Naqiyy? From Taqiyy to Kazim and from Sadiq?

This narration is very rare to find; why don't you publish and recite that recitation since it is the only household narration? We await your claim of Qur'anic recitation narration, whether it be (mutawatir or shadh) from the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam.

THE REPLY

There are two straight questions here:

- Where is the chain of narration of the Qur'an (recitation) according to the Shi'a? There is even a claim that all the narrators in the chain of narration of the Qur'an were Sunni (Ahlu Sunnah).
- Where is the chain of narration of the Qur'an from the Ahl al-Bayt, peace be upon them, who were considered leaders?

Qur'an al-Kareem just like hadith has chain of transmission/narrators linking the noble Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny. However, the most popular chain of recitation is that of Hafs. Interestingly, very little did our professor know that some of these narrators were Shi'a compared the bogus lies that they were all Sunnis. Besides, all of these transmissions go back to Shi'a first Imam, Ali ibn Abi Talib who the Ahlu Sunnah refused to

recognize as immediate successor after the Prophet despite the later clear injuctions.

CHAIN OF HAFS [MOST RECITED AND POPULAR RECITATION]

Hafs bin Sulaimaan bin Al-Mughairah Al-Asadee Al-Kufi on the recitation of Aasim bin Abi An-Najood Al-Kufi At-Taabi'ee on Abi Abd ar-Rahmaan Abdillah bin Habeeb As-Sulamee on the authority of 'Ali bin Abi Taalib from the noble Prophet from Jubril from Allah, the most High.

Hafs – Aasim – Abi Abd al-Rahman – Ali ibn Abi Taalib[215]

This chain leads to the most popular and widely known Qur'an recitation, although others exist and known but not as popular as that of Hafs.

QUICK LOOK AT QIRAT HAFS' NARRATORS

SUNNI SCHOLARS: The Sunni Imam Ibn Jawzi in his book al-Dua'afaa' saves us time and space by presenting the judgments of leading Sunni scholars on Hafs b. Sulayman b. al-Mughairah al-Asadi al-Kufi. He writes:

حفص بن سليمان بن المغيرة أبو عمر الأسدي القارىء البزاز وهو
صاحب عاصم ويقال له الغاضري وهو حفص بن أبي داود كوفي
حدث عن سماك بن حرب وليث وعاصم بن بهدلة وعلقمة بن مرثد
قال يحي ضعيف وقال مرة ليس بثقة وقال مرة كذاب وقال أحمد
ومسلم والنسائي متروك الحديث وقال البخاري تركوه وقال السعدي
قد فرغ منه منذ دهر وقال عبد الرحمن بن يوسف بن خراش كذاب

---

215 Abi Zur'ah Abd al-Rahman ibn Muhammad Zanjalah, *Hujah al-Qira'at* (Muasassat al-Risalah)[annotator: Sa'eed al-Afghani], pg. 57 – 59.

متروك يضع الحديث وقال ابن حبان كان يقلب الأسانيد ويرفع المراسيل وقال أبو زرعة والدارقطني ضعيف.

Hafs b. Sulayman b. al-Mughairah al-Asadi al-Kufi is the reciter and textile merchant. He is companion of 'Asim and its said he is Al-ghadiri, he is Hafs bin Dawood Kufi, narrates from Samak bin Harab, from laith, from 'Asim bin bhlah and from 'Alqama bin murthad. Imam Yahya said he is weak and also said he is not reliable and at another place said he is a liar. Imam Ahmed, Imam Muslim and Imam Nasai said he is abandon of Narration and Imam Bukhari has said leave him, As'asi said I have left him from long time. Abdul Alrahman bin Yousf said he is a liar and abandon of narration, he manipulate the narrations! Ibn Haban said he used to make fake chains and Abu zara'ah and Aldar qutni said he is a weak.[216]

Note: Al-ghadiri is a famous Shia region of Iraq.

About Aasim bin Abi An-Najood Al-Kufi At-Taabi'ee:

- **Imam Dhahabi writes:**

قال النسائي عاصم ليس بحافظ و قال الدارقطني في حفظه شيء}

عاصم بن أبي النجود الأسدي - القاريء:

Aasim b. Abi al-Najood al-Asadi – the Reciter: [Al-Nasai said Aism is not Hafiz (memorizer)! And Al-Darqutni said his memory is weak].[217]

---

[216] Jamaludin Abi al-Faraj Abd al-Rahman b. Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Jawzi, *Kitab al-Dua'afaa wa al-Matruk* [Dar al-Kitab al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut], part 1, pg. 221

[217] Al-Hafiz Shamsideen Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Uthman Ad-Dhahabi, al-Mughni fi ad-Dua'afaa' [Ihya at-Turath al-Islami, Qatar], part 1, pg. 458 (under alphabet ayn].

And about Abi Abd ar-Rahmaan Abdillah bin Habeeb As-Sulamee:

- Imam Dhahabi writes:

روى حسين الجعفي عن محمد بن ابان عن علقمه بن مرثد
ان ابا عبد الرحمن السلمي تعلم القران من عثمان بن عفان و عرض
على علي. قال شعبه: لم يسمع من عثمان كذا قال شعبه: و لم يتابع.
قال محمد ليس بحجة

Hasain bin Al-ju'afi narrating on the authority of Muhammad bin Aban from 'Alqama bin Marthad that Abi Abd ar-Rahmaan As-Sulamee learnt Quran from Uthman bin Affan and showed that to Ali bin Abi Talib. Shu'ba said I did not hear this from Uthman and he did not follow him (i.e Uthman)! (The Imam of Ahl Sunna) Muhammad said: he is not hujjat (proof).[218]

Interestingly, despite these terrible credentials, Sunni scholars claimed to have accepted their trustworthiness and reliability in Qur'an recitations and transmissions, but not in hadith transmissions.

---

[218] Al-Hafiz Shamsideen Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Uthman Ad-Dhahabi, Siyar A'lam an-Nubala' [Mu'asasat ar-Risalah], under Abu Abd ar-Rahman as-Sulamee, part 4, pg. 268 – 269

SHI'A SCHOLARS:

- About Hafs b. Sulayman b. al-Mughairah al-Asadi al-Kufi, Sheikh Tusi,[219] Sayyid Muhsin al-Amin,[220] and many others document:

حفص بن سليمان أبو عمرو الأسدي الغاضري المقري البزاز الكوفي .
ذكره الشيخ في رجاله في أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام و قد أسند
عنه

Hafs b. Sulayman Abu Umar al-Asadi al-Ghadiri the textile Merchant al-Kufi, he is mentioned by Sheikh (Tusi) in his Rijal among the companions of Imam Sadiq, peace be upon him, and he narrated from him.

- About Aasim bin Abi An-Najood Al-Kufi At-Taabi'ee:

Sayyid Muhsin al-Amin[221] writes:

عاصم بن أبي النجود : بـهدلة الكوفي ، أحد القراء السبعة قرأ على أبي
عبد الرحمن السلمي الذي قرأ على أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام ومن
أصحابه ، ونقل عن المنتهى للعلامة أنه قال : أحب القراءات إليّ
قراءة عاصم من طريق أبي بكر بن العياش وقرأ أبان بن تغلب الذي
هو شيخ الشيعة على عاصم ولعاصم روايتان الأولى رواية حفص بن
سليمان البزاز كان ابن زوجته الثانية ورواية أبي بكر بن عياش ،
وعاصم من الشيعة بلا كلام نص على ذلك القاضي نور الله والشيخ

---

[219] Abu Jafar Muhammad al-Hasan at-Tusi, Rijal at-Tusi [Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islami, Qum], pg. 189, no.2323

[220] Al-Sayyid Muhsin al-Amin, A'yan al-Shi'a [Dar al-Ta'aruf al-Matbu'aah, Beirut], vol. 6 pg. 201

[221] Al-Sayyid Muhsin al-Amin, A'yan al-Shi'a [Dar al-Ta'aruf al-Matbu'aah, Beirut], vol. 7 pg. 407

عبد الجليل الرازي المتوفى سنة 556 شيخ ابن شهرآشوب في كتاب نقض الفضائح أنه كان مقتدى الشيعة

Aasim bin Abi An-Najood Al-Kufi is one of the reciter of seven authentic recitation he learnt from Abd ar-Rahman Al-Sulami who learnt from the chief of believers Ali peace be upom him and from his companions, and this is reported in Almutaha of Allama (Tusi) who said my favorite recitation is recitation of Aasim bin Abi An-Najood Al Kufi on the authority of Abi Baker bin Al'aisah and Aba ibn Taglab recited the same who is the shia teacher of Aasim, about Aasim there are two narrations the first one he he was foster son of Aban ibn taglab from his second wife and second narration Aasim is the shia without any argument, which is in the book of Al-Qadi noor Allah and Alshikeh aljalil Alrazi died in 556 and sheikh shahar Ashub has quoted same in his book Naqd Alfadiel that he was a shia.

And about Abi Abd ar-Rahmaan Abdillah bin Habeeb As-Sulamee:

- Sheikh Abu Ali Hairi writes:

عبد الله بن حبيب السلمي: عن قي: في خواص علي عليه السلام من مضر: أبو عبد الرحمن عبد الله بن حبيب السلمي

Abdillah bin Habeeb As-Sulamee: amongst the special (companions of) of Ali, peace be upon him.[222]

CRITICAL POINTS AND CONCLUSION

---

[222] Abu Ali Muhammad ibn Ismail al-Hairi, Muntaha al-maqal fi ahwal al-Rijal [Mu'assasat Ahl al-Bayt li-Ihya al-Turath, Beirut], vol. 4, pg. 173

First, all the abovementioned personalities were confirmed Shi'a as against the bogus erroneous claim of our professor.

Second, their Qur'an training and education go back to Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib, peace be upon him. It is a futile effort by the Sunni scholars adding Uthman ibn Affan to the sanad sometimes. With all due respect, Uthman ibn Affan was never known as a Qur'an teacher or reciter. Adding him to the list is nothing but a desperate effort.

Third, it is unfathomable how the Sunni scholars demonized these personalities with weird claim that they were liars, unreliable and poor memorizers in hadith transmission but trustworthy, reliable and good memorizer in the Qur'an. What a judgement! It is safe to conclude that these noble men received this backlash and unthoughtful judgement only for being Shi'a or suspected of Shi'ism. However, they are all in the good book of the Shi'a whether in hadith narration and transmission or Qur'an reading and transmission.

Lastly, Shi'a were not only the leading figures in Qur'an recitation and transmission but also in other subjects related to the book of Allah. For example, the first ever book to be written and published on the meaning of the Qur'an was written by yet another prolific Qur'anic reciter by the name of Aban ibn Taghlib Shi'i[223] (141 A.H). He was a staunch Shi'a and a well-known disciple of Imam Ali ibn Husein Zayn al-Abideen, Imam Muhammad al-Baqir and Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq. He is considered the most outstanding Quran reciter and his style of Quranic recitation was very famous.

---

[223] Al-Hafiz Shamsideen Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Uthman Ad-Dhahabi, Siyar A'lam an-Nubala' [Mu'asasat ar-Risalah], part 6, pg. 308 – 309

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

WHAT IS MUS'HAF OF FATIMAH?

Question 26:

The Qur'an of Fatima that you always reference was mentioned in your book "Al-Kafi" (1/239). A stranger came to the house of Abu Ja'far and said, "I want to ask you a question, but please confirm whether there is secrecy in the house." He opened a curtain and replied, "Ask whatever you wish." The infallible Imam said, "We really have a Qur'an called the Qur'an of Fatima; it is a Qur'an that triples your Qur'an. In the content of our Qur'an, there is not a single word that you have in your Qur'an." What an amazing situation—a Qur'an without Bismillah?! Is the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, aware of this Qur'an or not? If he is aware, why did he not inform his companions? Why did he hide it from the Ummah? While Allah says: "Oh Messenger of Allah! Proclaim (the message) which has been sent down to you by your Lord. And if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message..."

But if you say he is not aware of it, then how did you come across it? The fact is that a Shi'ite scholar, Dabrisi, has revealed the secret by publishing a book titled "Comprehensive Explanation in Confirming the Changes of Allah's Book." He presented more than two thousand narrations from Shi'ites that confirmed this Qur'an is pirated/fake. He included views from Shi'ite jurists and hadith scholars, all of whom Shi'ites regard as the most highly respected scholars of their creed. He concluded by saying: "It is imperative to believe that the present Qur'an of the Ummah is fake."

However, Sayyid Hashimul Bahrani, the author of Al-Burhan, said in the introduction (pp. 49): "In my opinion, as this issue has been well researched and confirmed, it is

imperative to authorize every Shi'ite to believe as a pillar of faith that this Qur'an is not authentic. This was the aim of the tyrant leaders who ruled before Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu. Let's reason more and judge their actions." Yes, we reason, think, and confirm your fallacies.

Ni'imatullahi Jaza'iri, a Shi'ite scholar, responded to those who believe the Qur'an is original. He replied as follows: "Whoever believes that this entire Qur'an that is with the Ummah is the original Qur'an revealed through Jibril has contradicted the narrations of our leaders and friends because their narrations are (Mutawatir). By believing in that, he automatically ceases to be a Shi'ite" (Al-Anwarun-Nu'umaniyyah 2/357).

Furthermore, it was reported from Al-Kafi: "Whoever thinks there is an original complete Qur'an in possession of any being is a great liar. This is because no one memorized it as it was revealed from Allah except Ali and the leaders who came from his progeny."

Al-Khu'i, a great contemporary Shi'ite scholar, stated in the book titled "Lillahi Summa lit Tarikh" (pp. 80): "I urge you to use this Qur'an of our present time before the Qur'an of Fatima is revealed."

What a surprise! The Qur'an should be used for occasional purposes? When and where is the original Qur'an? They do not possess Fatima's Qur'an, nor is it in their memory; we know there is no special Qur'an left for Fatima. The Shi'ites claim to have more than Fatima's Qur'an; they have among others Al-Jami'ah, whose details are found in Al-Kafi (1/239) and Biharul Anwar (26/25). They have another Qur'an called "An Namus," which was mentioned in Biharul Anwar (25/117). There is also another book/manuscript which they claim was revealed; it is called Al-Abitah and was mentioned in Biharul Anwar (26/37). Another one is called "Zu'abatus Saifi," found in Biharul Anwar (25/56). Lastly, they also have Al-Jafar, which they believe is a revealed book from Allah (Usulul Kafi 1/24).

THE REPLY

Whoever has followed the trend of our professor's questions and our academic replies and expositions will by now take whatever comes out from his mouth with a pinch of salt. This question and claims are no different from the previous ones in their usual lies, fabrications, propaganda and sheer ignorance.

First, on the issue of Mus'haf Fatimah, al-Jafr, al-Jami' and so on that were with the Imams of the Ahl al-Bayt, none of it has ever been claimed to be al-Qur'an or the like of the Qur'an. However, in the weirdest imagination of the Professor, anything said to be revealed from Allah must have been "a Qur'an." Hence, his repetitive statement that "Shi'a has other Qur'an called Mus'haf.... They have another Qur'an called al-Jafr." The weird Professor writes:

"The Qur'an of Fatima that you always make reference to, was mentioned in your book "Al-Kafi" (1/239); a stranger came to the house of Abu Ja'afar and say; I want to ask you a question but confirm weather there is secrecy in the house, he opened through a curtain and replied; ask what ever you wish, the infallible Imam said; we really have a Qur'an called the Qur'an of Fatima, is a Qur'an that triple your Qur'an, in the content of our Qur'an, there is no any word which you have in your Qur'an. What an amazing situation, a Qur'an without Bismillah?"

Now, let us compare the above distortion of the Professor with what is actually documented in Kitab al-Kafi.

Sheikh Kulayni documents:

عِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِنَا عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ الْحَجَّالِ عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ عُمَرَ الْحَلَبِيِّ عَنْ أَبِي بَصِيرٍ قَالَ

دَخَلْتُ عَلَى أَبِي عَبْدِ اللهِ(عليه السلام) فَقُلْتُ لَهُ جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ إِنِّي أَسْأَلُكَ عَنْ مَسْأَلَةٍ هَاهُنَا أَحَدٌ يَسْمَعُ كَلَامِي قَالَ فَرَفَعَ أَبُو عَبْدِ اللهِ(عليه السلام) سِتْراً بَيْنَهُ وَ بَيْنَ بَيْتٍ آخَرَ فَاطَّلَعَ فِيهِ ثُمَّ قَالَ يَا أَبَا مُحَمَّدٍ سَلْ عَمَّا بَدَا لَكَ قَالَ قُلْتُ جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ إِنَّ شِيعَتَكَ يَتَحَدَّثُونَ

أَنّ رَسُولَ اللهِ(صلى الله عليه و آله وسلم) عَلّمَ عَلِيّاً(عليه السلام) بَاباً يُفْتَحُ لَهُ مِنْهُ أَلْفُ بَابٍ قَالَ فَقَالَ يَا أَبَا مُحَمّدٍ عَلّمَ رَسُولُ اللهِ(صلى الله عليه و آله وسلم) عَلِيّاً(عليه السلام) أَلْفَ بَابٍ يُفْتَحُ مِنْ كُلّ بَابٍ أَلْفُ بَابٍ قَالَ قُلْتُ هَذَا وَ اللهِ الْعِلْمُ قَالَ فَنَكَتَ سَاعَةً فِي الْأَرْضِ ثُمّ قَالَ إِنّهُ لَعِلْمٌ وَ مَا هُوَ بِذَاكَ قَالَ ثُمّ قَالَ يَا أَبَا مُحَمّدٍ وَ إِنّ عِنْدَنَا الْجَامِعَةَ وَ مَا يُدْرِيهِمْ مَا الْجَامِعَةُ قَالَ قُلْتُ جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ وَ مَا الْجَامِعَةُ قَالَ صَحِيفَةٌ طُولُهَا سَبْعُونَ ذِرَاعاً بِذِرَاعِ رَسُولِ اللهِ(صلى الله عليه و آله وسلم) وَ إِمْلَائِهِ مِنْ فَلْقِ فِيهِ وَ خَطّ عَلِيّ بِيَمِينِهِ فِيهَا كُلّ حَلَالٍ وَ حَرَامٍ وَ كُلّ شَيْءٍ يَحْتَاجُ النَاسُ إِلَيْهِ حَتّي الْأَرْشُ فِي الْخَدْشِ وَ ضَرَبَ بِيَدِهِ إِلَيّ فَقَالَ تَأْذَنُ لِي يَا أَبَا مُحَمّدٍ قَالَ قُلْتُ جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ إِنّمَا أَنَا لَكَ فَاصْنَعْ مَا شِئْتَ قَالَ فَغَمَزَنِي بِيَدِهِ وَ قَالَ حَتّي أَرْشُ هَذَا كَأَنّهُ مُغْضَبٌ قَالَ قُلْتُ هَذَا وَ اللهِ الْعِلْمُ قَالَ إِنّهُ لَعِلْمٌ وَ لَيْسَ بِذَاكَ ثُمّ سَكَتَ سَاعَةً ثُمّ قَالَ وَ إِنّ عِنْدَنَا الْجَفْرَ وَ مَا يُدْرِيهِمْ مَا الْجَفْرُ قَالَ قُلْتُ وَ مَا الْجَفْرُ قَالَ وِعَاءٌ مِنْ أَدَمٍ فِيهِ عِلْمُ النَبِيّينَ وَ الْوَصِيّينَ وَ عِلْمُ الْعُلَمَاءِ الّذِينَ مَضَوْا مِنْ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ قَالَ قُلْتُ إِنّ هَذَا هُوَ الْعِلْمُ قَالَ إِنّهُ لَعِلْمٌ وَ لَيْسَ بِذَاكَ ثُمّ سَكَتَ سَاعَةً ثُمّ قَالَ وَ إِنّ عِنْدَنَا لَمُصْحَفَ فَاطِمَةَ(عليه السلام) وَ مَا يُدْرِيهِمْ مَا مُصْحَفُ فَاطِمَةَ(عليه السلام) قَالَ قُلْتُ وَ مَا مُصْحَفُ فَاطِمَةَ(عليه السلام) قَالَ مُصْحَفٌ فِيهِ مِثْلُ قُرْآنِكُمْ هَذَا ثَلَاثَ مَرّاتٍ وَ اللهِ مَا فِيهِ مِنْ قُرْآنِكُمْ حَرْفٌ وَاحِدٌ.

A number of our companions has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad from ‘Abdallah ibn al- Hajjal from Ahmad ibn ‘Umar al-Halabi from abu Basir who has said the following:

"I went to abu ‘Abdallah (peace be upon him) and said, "May Allah take my soul in service for your cause, I like to ask you a question. Is there anyone else in this house who

may hear my words?" The Imams (peace be upon him) then folded the curtain between his room and the other room next to it and looked into it. Then the Imams (peace be upon him) said, "O abu Muhammad, ask whatever you wish." I said, "May Allah take my soul in service for your cause, your followers say that the Messenger of Allah taught Ali (peace be upon him) a thousand chapter of knowledge and from each chapter there opens a thousand chapter. I then said, 'This, I swear by Allah, is knowledge.'" He would mark the ground with his staff (a sign of thinking in normal people) for a while and said, "That is knowledge but it is not that." The narrators has said that The Imam (peace be upon him) then said, "O abu Muhammad, with us there is al-Jami'a. What do they know what al-Jami' i?" I then asked, "May Allah take my soul in service for your cause, what is al-Jami'a? The Imam (peace be upon him) said, it is a parchment seventy yards by the yards long of the Messenger of Allah's dictations written with Ali (peace be upon him)'s hand writing. It contains all the lawful and unlawful and all matters that people need, even the law to of compensation [for a number of our people has narrated] from scratch caused to a person. He then stretched his hand to me and asked, 'May I, O abu Muhammad?' I then replied, "May Allah take my soul in service for your cause, I am all at your disposal." He pinched me with his hand and said, "Even there is the law of compensation for this." He seemed angry. The narrator has said, "I then said, "This, I swear by Allah is knowledge." The Imams (peace be upon him) said, "It certainly is knowledge but not that one." The Imams (peace be upon him) remained silent for a while and then said, "With us there is al-Jafr (the parchment). What do they know what al-Jafr is? I then asked, "What is al-Jafr (the parchment or a container)?" The Imams (peace be upon him) said, "It is a container made of skin that contains the knowledge of the prophets and the executors of their wills and the knowledge of the scholars in the past from the Israelites." The narrator has said that he then said, "This certainly, is the knowledge." The Imam (peace be upon him) said, "It certainly is knowledge but not that knowledge." The Imams (peace be upon him) remained

silent for a while and then said, "With us there is the book (Mushaf) of Fatima, (peace be upon her). What do they know what Mushaf of Fatima is? The Imam (a.s.) said, "Mushaf of Fatima is three times bigger than your Quran. There is not even a single letter therein from your Quran." The narrator has said, "I then said, "This, I swear by Allah, is the knowledge." The Imam (a.s.) said, "This certainly is knowledge, but it is not that. ..."[224]

Fabrication 1:

Our Professor lied that Imam Abi Abdillah Ja'far Sadiq (peace be upon him) said, "we really have a Qur'an called the Qur'an of Fatima, is a Qur'an that triple your Qur'an..." whereas what we have in the narration is, "With us there is the book (Mushaf) of Fatima, (peace be upon her).

What do they know what Mushaf of Fatima is? The Imam (peace be upon him) said, "Mushaf of Fatima is three times bigger than your[225] Quran. There is not even a single letter therein from your Quran."

So, what is mushaf of Fatima that is three times bigger (in size) than the Qur'an, and it is so different as to its content from the Qur'an? Again, Sheikh Kulayni gives us a detail about this book.

---

[224] Muhammad b. Yaqub Kulayni, *kitab al-Kafi* (Beirut edition), Book of people with divine authority, chapter 40 [Statements about al-Jafr, al-Jami' and Mushaf of Fatima], vol. 1, p. 468, hadith no.1

[225] Some may ask, 'why did Imam used the phrase "your Qur'an"; isn't the Qur'an his too? Why can't he say "our Qur'an?" There's absolutely nothing in such expression as it is a regular expression used to clarify doubt. In fact, it is not only used by the Prophet but also by the Arabs. For example, Imam Tirmidhi documents: "*It was narrated that Anas said: 'The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: 'There was no Prophet except that he warned his Ummah of the liar who is blind in one eye. Lo! He is blind in one eye, and **your Lord** is not blind in one eye...*" [Jami' al-Tirmidhi, hadith 2245].

He documents:

عِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِنَا عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ عُمَرَ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ عَنْ حَمَّادِ بْنِ عُثْمَانَ قَالَ

سَمِعْتُ أَبَا عَبْدِ اللهِ(عليه السلام) يَقُولُ تَظْهَرُ الزَّنَادِقَةُ فِي سَنَةِ ثَمَانٍ وَ عِشْرِينَ وَ مِائَةٍ وَ ذَلِكَ أَنِّي نَظَرْتُ فِي مُصْحَفِ فَاطِمَةَ(عليه السلام) قَالَ قُلْتُ وَ مَا مُصْحَفُ فَاطِمَةَ قَالَ إِنَّ اللهَ تَعَالَى لَمَّا قَبَضَ نَبِيَّهُ(صلى الله عليه و آله وسلم) دَخَلَ عَلَى فَاطِمَةَ(عليه السلام) مِنْ وَفَاتِهِ مِنَ الْحُزْنِ مَا لَا يَعْلَمُهُ إِلَّا اللهُ عَزَّ وَ جَلَّ فَأَرْسَلَ اللهُ إِلَيْهَا مَلَكاً يُسَلِّي غَمَّهَا وَ يُحَدِّثُهَا فَشَكَتْ ذَلِكَ إِلَى أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ(عليه السلام) فَقَالَ إِذَا أَحْسَسْتِ بِذَلِكِ وَ سَمِعْتِ الصَّوْتَ قُولِي لِي فَأَعْلَمَتْهُ بِذَلِكَ فَجَعَلَ أَمِيرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ(عليه السلام) يَكْتُبُ كُلَّ مَا سَمِعَ حَتَّى أَثْبَتَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ مُصْحَفاً قَالَ ثُمَّ قَالَ أَمَا إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ فِيهِ شَيْ ءٌ مِنَ الْحَلَالِ وَ الْحَرَامِ وَ لَكِنْ فِيهِ عِلْمُ مَا يَكُونُ

A number of our people has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad from 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz from ibn 'Uthman who has said that he heard abu 'Abdallah (peace be upon him) say the following:

"The heretics will appear in the year one hundred twenty-eight (745/746AD) because I have found it in the Mushaf of Fatima (peace be upon him)." The narrator has said that he asked the Imams (peace be upon him), "What is Mushaf of Fatima?" The Imams (peace be upon him) said, "When Allah took the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) from this world, it caused such a degree of grief to Fatima (peace be upon her) that only Allah, the Most Holy, the Most High, knows its extent. Allah then sent an angel to her to offer solace and speak to her. She complained about it to Amir al-Mu'minin Ali (peace be upon him) who asked her to inform him whenever she would find the angel speak to her. She then informed him

when the angel came to speak. Amir al-Mu'minin Ali (peace be upon him) then would write down all that he would hear of the conversations of the angel so much so that his notes took the shape of a whole book.' The Imam (peace be upon him) then said, "There was nothing in it of the knowledge of the lawful and unlawful matters but it had the knowledge of things that had happened and things to happen in future.[226]

So, the Mushaf of Fatimah was a book that contained knowledge of the past events and future events. In fact, in another hadith, it is reported:

"The narrator has said that he asked the Imam (peace be upon him), "What is Mushaf of Fatima?" The Imam (peace be upon him) waited for quite a while. Then he said, "You ask about what you really mean and what you do not mean. Fatima (peace be upon her) lived after the Messenger of Allah for seventy-five days. She was severely depressed because of the death of her father. Jibril (peace be upon him) would come to provide her solace because of the death of her father. Jibril would comfort her soul. Jibril would inform her about her father and his place and of the future events and about what will happen to her children. At the same time Ali (peace be upon him) would write all of them down and this is Mushaf of Fatima (peace be upon her)."[227]

We appeal to justice how a book with this description is "al-Qur'an" or its like?!

Fabrication 2:

The Professor also lied against the Shi'a when he says, "The Shi'ites claim to have more than Fatima's Qur'an, they have among others, Al-Jami'ah." What does the abovementioned Shi'a hadith say? It says:

"...The Imam (peace be upon him) then said, "O abu Muhammad, with us there is al-Jami'a. What do they

---

[226] Ibid, vol. 1, p. 470, hadith no. 2

[227] Ibid, pg. 472, hadith no. 5

know what al-Jami' i?" I then asked, "May Allah take my soul in service for your cause, what is al-Jami'a? The Imam (peace be upon him) said, it is a parchment seventy yards by the yards long of the Messenger of Allah's dictations written with Ali (peace be upon him)'s hand writing..."

Fabrication 3:

The Professor continues with his chain of lies when he says:

Further more, the following was reported from Al-kafi; "who ever thinks there is an original complete Qur'an in possession of any being is a great liar. This is because no one memorized it how it was revealed from Allah only Aliyu and the leaders that came from his progeny.

On the contrary, Sheikh Kulayni documents:

Muhammad ibn Yahya has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad from Ibn Mahbub from 'Amr ibn abu al-Miqdam from Jabir who has said that he heard abu Ja'far (peace be upon him) say the following: "No one from the people has claimed to have collected the whole of the Qur'an (in a book form) as it was revealed. If anyone would come up with such a claim, he is a liar. No one collected this holy Book and memorized as Allah, the Most Holy, the Most High, revealed it except Ali ibn Abi Talib (peace be upon him) and the Imams after him."[228]

It is agreed upon that the first chapter revealed of the Qur'an was surah al-Alaq and the last chapter revealed was surah al-Maidah. The Qur'an collected by Ali ibn Abi Talib arranged the surahs in series of their revelation, and he memorized them also in the same order of their revelation. Only Ali ibn Abi Talib did this as it is documented that other sahabah had different Qur'anic manuscripts in terms of their arrangement. For example, today what we are using is Uthman's collection put

---

[228] Muhammad b. Yaqub Kulayni, kitab al-Kafi (Beirut edition), Book of people with divine authority, chapter 35 [No one collect all of the Qur'an except ...], vol. 1, p. 450, hadith no.1

together by Zayd ibn Thabit, and in it the first Surah that was revealed (surah al-Alaq) is in Chapter 96 and the last surah revealed occupied the 5th chapter, and so on. However, all Muslims agreed they are of the same content.[229]

Fabrication 4:

This time around, our professor quoted an obscure and imaginary sentence. He writes:

Al-Khu'i, a great Shi'ite scholar of the contemporary time was quoted in the book titled "Lillahi Summa lit Tarikh" pp 80 he said the following; "I urge you to use this Qur'an of our present time before the Qur'an of Fatima is revealed."

First, both the book "lillahi thumma li Tarikh [by God, then by history]" and its author Sayyid Husein al-Musawi who (in the book) posed to be a former Shi'a turned Sunni have unknown identification in the entire Shi'a world. Interestingly, the unknown Sayyid Husein al-Musawi claimed in his book to be a student of late Ayatullah Sayyid Abu'l-Qasim al-Khue'i but there was no student of his by such name, and there wasn't anyone of that name with such description (as stated in the book) in the entire Shi'a world not to mention Iraq where Ayatullah al-Khue'i resided.

How do we know this much? Another book was written titled "Lillahi walil Haqiqa: Raddu ala Kitab lillahi thumma Li tarikh [by God and by the Truth: a rebuttal on the book lillahi thumma li-Tarikh]"[230] by Sheikh Ali Āl Muhsin. The beauty about this book is that the little descriptions given by the unknown Sayyid Husein al-Musawi were explored. Then, his claims and submissions

---

[229] Kindly read chapter 24 [reply to question 24] of this book for more details.

[230] Both books are available on the internet. A truth seeker will read both to discover the truth

were also investigated. In both cases, the irreconcilable lies were laid bare.

Second, the sentence, "I urge you to use this Qur'an of our present time before the Qur'an of Fatima is revealed" which is accredited to al-Khue'i [i.e Ayatullah Sayyid Abu-l Qassim al-Khoe'i] can be looked into in the following:

- The statement is obscure and doesn't make any sense
- The statement has no reference in any of the works [books, speeches, risalah etc] of Sayyid al-Khoe'i.

In summary, whatever point our professor is trying to establish here is baseless.

Fabrication 5:

Another quotation from the Professor reads:

"However, sayyid Hashimul Bahrani the author of Al-Burhan said in the introduction pp "49!" is of the opinion that as this issue has been well researched and confirmed, it is imperating to authorize every Shi'ite to believe as pillar of faith that this Qur'an is not authentic."

In one bold statement, we say this claim can never be found in al-Bur'han of Allamah Sayyid Hashim al-Bahrani. It is another fabrication of our professor.

Fabrication 6:

The last fabrication of Professor Muhammad Mansur Ibrahim is even grand and wicked compared to the previous ones. He writes:

"Ni'imatullahi Jaza'iri, a Shi'ite scholar was giving a reply and challenge to those that believe the Qur'an is original, he replied as follows; "Who ever believes that the whole of this Qur'an that is with the Ummah is the original Qur'an revealed through Jibril has contradicted the narrations of our leaders, and friends, because their narrations are

(Mutawatir). But by believing in that, he is automatically not a Shi'ite" (Al-Anwarun Nu'umaniyyah 2/357)

First, what Sayyid Ni'hmatullah al-Jazairi was discussing in the aforementioned chapter of the book is about various "qira'at al-Qur'an – recitation of the Qur'an." Unfortunately, the Professor framed his point as "the whole of this Qur'an."

It is known in the Sunni beliefs that there are 7 to 10 different recitations for the Quran.[231] For example, a particular recitation reads "sirata ledhina an'amta alayhim" while another recitation reads "Zirata ledhina an'amta 'alayhUm." Another recitation is "wa-msahu bi ruhusikum wa ar'juLAkum" as against "wa-msahu bi ruhusikum wa ar'juLIkum" and so on.

Second, it is very imperative at this point to quote the discussion from the book "al-Anwaar an-Numaniyyah" of al-Jazairi verbatim; then, one can easily compare it with the professor's wicked fabrication.

Sayyid Ni'hmatullah al-Jazairi writes:

"First, what has been said by our jurists (may Allah be pleased with them all) on the obligatory usage of a single recitation from the seven widely reported recitations, and the tawattur (concurrent or wide report) of the whole ten (recitations, i.e) with the addition of Abi Ja'far, Ya'qoub and khalaf, there is disagreement. It is established from the two Shahid (Martyrs) – may Allah sanctify their souls – on the affirmation of its tawattur and permisibility of their recitation.

قال الشهيد لثاني (ر) في شرح الرسالة: و أما اتباع قراءة الواحد من العشرة في جميع السورة فغير واجب قطعا بل ولا مستحب; فإنا الكل

---

231 Question No. 25 of Professor Mansur is on this issue although he tagged it as "Qur'an narration."

من عند الله نزل به الروح الأمين على قلب سيد المرسلين تخفيفا على الأمة، وتهوينا على أهل هذه الملة انتهى، وهو مصرح بأن القراءات السبع بل العشر متواترة النقل من الوحي الإلهي: وكذلك كلام أكثر الأصحاب، وقد تكلمنا معهم في شرحنا على تعذيب الحديث: ولنذكر ههنا نبذة منه فنقول.

Shahid)Martyr(al-Thani (may Allah have mercy on him) said in his commentary on the Risalah: "As for adhering to the recitation of one of the ten [Qur'anic] readings for the entire surah, it is certainly not obligatory, nor is it recommended. This is because all [the readings] are from Allah, revealed by the Trustworthy Spirit to the heart of the Master of Messengers, as a form of ease for the nation and facilitation for the followers of this religion."

He concluded, explicitly stating that the seven readings, and even the ten, are transmitted through mutawatir chains from divine revelation. This is also the view of the majority of scholars. We have discussed this matter extensively in our commentary on Ta'dhib al-Hadith, and we will mention a portion of it here. Thus, we say:

الثالث أن تسليم تواترها عن الوحي الإلهي و كون الكل قد نزل به الروح الأمين يفضي إلى طرح الأخبار المستفيضة بل المتواترة الدالة بصريحها على وقوع التحريف في القرأن كلاما ومادة: وإعرابا مع أن أصحابنا رضوان الله عليهم قد أطبقوا على صحتها والتصديق بها نعم قد خالف فيها المرتضى و الصدوق والشيخ الطبرسي و حكموا بأن ما بين دفتي هذا المصحف هو القرآن المنزل لا غير; ولم يقع فيه تحريف ولا تبديل ومن هنا ضبط شيخنا الطبرسي (ر) آيات القرآن وأجزاءه; وروي عن النبي (ص) أن جميع سور القرآن مائة وأربع عشرة سورة ...وجميع آيات القرآن ستة آلاف آية ومائتا آية و ست وثلاثون آية

The third point is that accepting the continuity of its transmission as divine revelation and that all of it was delivered by the trustworthy spirit (Gabriel) leads to dismissing the widespread, even mutawatir (mass-transmitted), reports explicitly indicating alterations in the Qur'an—whether in its words, content, or grammatical structure. This is despite the fact that our scholars, may Allah's mercy be upon them, have unanimously acknowledged the authenticity of these reports and affirmed their validity. However, figures such as Al-Murtadha, Al-Saduq, and Sheikh Al-Tabarsi have opposed this view, asserting that what is between the covers of this mushaf is the revealed Qur'an and nothing else, and that no distortion or substitution has occurred within it. Consequently, our Sheikh Al-Tabarsi (may Allah have mercy on him) meticulously recorded the verses and sections of the Qur'an. It is narrated from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that the Qur'an consists of 114 surahs, and the total number of its verses is 6,236."[232]

Here, there is a group of Shi'a scholars who agreed and accepted the tawattur reports of different recitations of the Qur'an. On the other hand, other scholars did not believe in it as they understood such differences in recitations to be tahrif (alteration and distortion) in the Qur'an. This group believe "...ruled that between the two covers of this copy of the Qur'an (i.e the one with people) is the Qur'an alone, no other. There was no alteration or distortion in it."

We appeal to justice how any of these two opinions corresponds with the fabrication of the Professor:

"Whoever believes that the whole of this Qur'an that is with the Ummah is the original Qur'an revealed through Jibril has contradicted the narrations of our leaders, and friends, because their narrations are (Mutawatir)."

---

[232] Ni'hmatullah al-Jazairi, *al-Anwaar an-Numaniyyah* [Mu'asassat al-A'lam li matbuhaah, Beirut, 1431], vol 2 pg. 310 – 315.

We seek Allah's refuge from sheer ignorance, hatred and fanaticism which block reasoning and kill human heart.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

GOING IN CIRCLE

Question 27:

It is a known fact that your books are filled with postulations that companions because of their selfish desires faked the Qur'an. Then, do you have any narration that shows that the Qur'an is complete and has originality? I reply by saying you have no narration that says this in your books, but you can challenge me by bringing your proofs.

THE REPLY

This question is a carbon-copy of question 23, and justice has been done to it in our reply. However, we will leave this chapter with the words of Sayyid al-Askari.

He writes:

وما ذكرناه يدلك على أن مدرسة أهل البيت لا تعتبر أي كتاب حديث لديها صحيحا ، سواء الكافي منها وما دونها شهرة ، وبعدها زمانا . وانها تؤمن بأن كتاب الله القرآن وحده صحيح من الجلد إلى الجلد ولا شريك له في الصحة

What we have mentioned proves to you that the School of the Ahl al-Bayt do not consider ANY book of ḥadīth with them as all-ṣaḥīḥ, whether it is al-Kāfī from them or any other less popular or later one. They believe that the Book of Allāh, the Qur'ān alone is all-ṣaḥīḥ [authentic] from cover to cover, and it has no partner in terms of authenticity.[233]

---

[233] Sayyid Murtaḍā al-Askarī, *Mu'ālim al-Madrasatayn*, vol. 3, p. 282. http://shiaweb.org/books/maalem_al-madresatain_3/pa53.html

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

OUT OF THE WINDOW

Question 28:

During the reign of Aliy Radiyallahu Anhu, why didn't he produce those books? If during the reigns of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, he was not in power; then, during his reign, he has absolute authority not to fear anything or anyone. Why didn't he produce it to put the Ummah in the right path? You also claim that Ali Radiyallahu Anhu has the Qur'an as it was revealed i.e. from Suratul Alaq to "alyauma akmaltu lakum ..." which is different from the Qur'an that the Prophet and the companions arranged, but his own is chronologically arranged, then why didn't he produce it during his reign?

THE REPLY

First, we have already [in our reply to question 26] exposed the lies of the Professor concerning what he tagged to be "other Shi'a Qur'an." We have exposed those books to be personal books of knowledge of Ahli Muhammad (Prophet's household) and not for general consumption. Therefore, the question of our Prof. [During the reign of Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu why didn't he produce those books] is an irrelevant question which is to be thrown out of the window. A golden example of these books of knowledge is Mus'haf Fatima. This book is said to have contained the knowledge of the past and future events. This no doubt is a vast knowledge; hence, the ace Sunni Imam 'Abd al-Razzaq documents:

عبد الرزاق عن معمر عن وهب بن عبد الله عن أبي الطفيل قال

شهدت عليا وهو يخطب وهو يقول سلوني فوالله لا تسألوني عن شئ

يكون إلى يوم القيامة إلا حدثتكم به وسلوني عن كتاب الله فوالله ما من آية إلا وأنا أعلم بليل نزلت أم بنهار أم في سهل أم في جبل

'Abd al-Razzaq – Ma'mar – Wahb b. 'Abd Allah – Abu al-Tufayl:

I witnessed 'Ali while he was delivering a sermon and saying, "Ask me! I swear by Allah, you will not ask me about ANYTHING that will occur up till the Day of Resurrection except that I will inform you of it. Ask me about the Book of Allah. I swear by Allah, there is NOT a single verse except that I know whether it was revealed during the night or during the day, or on a level land or on a mountain.[234]

All the narrators in this narration are thiqa (trustworthy)[235] making the athar (narration) authentic.

We also realized that another book was al-Jafr' which is describe as "... a container made of skin that contains the knowledge of the prophets and the executors of their wills and the knowledge of the scholars in the past from the Israelites."

On this, another ace Sunni Imam Ibn Jarir Tabari (d. 310 H) documents:

حدثنا ابن المثنى، قال: ثنا محمد بن جعفر، قال: ثنا شعبة، عن القاسم بن أبي بزة، قال: سمعت أبا الطفيل، قال: سمعت عليا رضي الله عنه عنه يقول: لا تسألوني عن كتاب ناطق، ولا

---

[234] Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-Ṣana'ani, Tafsir al-Qur'an (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd; 1st edition, 1410 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Muslim Muhammad], vol. 3, p. 241

[235] Ahmad b. Ali b. Hajar al-Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Illmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 1, p. 599, no. 4078; vol. 2, p. 202, no. 6833; vol. 2, p. 292, no. 7505.

سنة ماضية، إلا حدثتكم، فسأله ابن الكواء عن الذاريات،

فقال: هي الرياح

Ibn al-Muthanna – Muhammad b. Ja'far – Shu'bah – al-Qasim b. Abi Bazzah – Abu al-Tufayl:

I heard 'Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, saying, "You will not ask me about ANY articulate Book or ANY bygone Sunnah, except that I will tell you." So, Ibn al-Kawa asked him about al-Zariyat, and he replied, "It is the winds"[236]

The chain of this narration is also the chain relied upon by Imam Muslim in his Sahih[237] therefore, it is authentic. In summary, "those books" were personal properties of the ahl al-Bayt, and are not for public consumption.

The professor presents his second point:

You also claim that Ali Radiyallahu Anhu has the Qur'an as it was revealed ... his own is chronologically, then why didn't he produce it during his reign?

Sunni scholars of 'Ulūm al-Qur'an (sciences of the Qur'an) have exposed the nature of the respective Masāhif (Qur'an manuscript) of various Sahabah especially, that of 'Ali ibn Abi Tālib. For example:

Allamah Badr al-Din Muhammad ibn Abdillah al-Zar'kishi documents:

وقال القاضي أبو بكر بن الطيب: فإن قيل: قد اختلف السلف في ترتيب القرآن، فمنهم من كتب في المصحف السور على تاريخ نزولها، وقدم المكي على المدني. ومنهم جعل من أوله: (اقرأ باسم ربك)؛ وهو

---

[236] al-Ṭabari, Jami al-Bayan fi Tawil al-Qur'an (Dar al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Ṣadafi Jamil al-'Attar], vol. 26, p. 240

[237] Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 3, pg. 1567, hadith no. 1978 (45).

أول مصحف علي، وأما مصحف ابن مسعود، فأوله (مالك يوم الدين) ثم البقرة، ثم النساء على ترتيب مختلف. وفي مصحف أبي كان أوله الحمد

Al-Qādhi Abu Bakr bin al-Tayyib said: If it is said: The Salaf differed in the order of the Qur'an, for some of them wrote the surahs in the Qur'an on the date of their revelation, and the Meccan (surahs) took precedence over the Madinah (surahs). And some of them put in its beginning: (Read in the name of your Lord [surah Al-Alaq]); It is the first (chapter in the) Mushaf of Ali, and as for the Mushaf of Ibn Masoud, the first is (Malik Yom al-Din), then al-Baqarah, then the Nisa in a different order. And in my father's Qur'an, the beginning of it was praise....[238]

Also, Shaykh Muhammad Abdul Hayy al-Kitani writes:

وكسيدنا علي فإنه جمع القرآن على ترتيب النزول، عقب موت ... النبي أخرجه ابن أبي داود (وانظر فتح الباري)

... And as our master Ali, he compiled the Qur'an according to the order of revelation, after the death of the Prophet. It was narrated by Ibn Abi Dawood (and see Fath al-Bari).[239]

And lastly, the Sunni Qur'an scientist, Abdur-Rahman As-Suyuti documents:

عن محمد بن سيرين قال: نبئت أن عليا أبطأ عن بيعة أبي بكر فلقيه أبو بكر فقال أكرهت إمارتي؟ قال لا، ولكن آليت بيمين أن لا أرتدي برداء إلا إلى الصلاة حتى أجمع القرآن، قال فزعموا أنه

---

238 Badr al-Din Muhammad ibn Abdillah al-Zar'kishi, *al-Bur'han fi Ulum al-Qur'an* (Cairo: Dar al-Ma`rifah), vol. 1, pg. 259

239 Muhammad Abdul Hayy al-Kitani, *Nizām al-Hukumat an-Nabawiyyah al-Tarātib al-Adāriyah*, vol. 1, pg. 106

كتبه على تنزيله قال محمد: فلو أصبت ذلك الكتاب كان فيه علم،
(قال ابن عون: فسألت عكرمة عن ذلك الكتاب فلم يعرفه.

On the authority of Muhammad bin Sirin who said: I was told that Ali was recluctant to pledge allegiance to Abu Bakr, so Abu Bakr met him and said: Do you hate my Khilafah? He said no, but I made an oath that I would not wear a cloak except for prayer until I had collected the Qur'an. He said, so they claimed that he wrote it [the Qur'an] based on its order of revelation. Muhammad said: If I was to get that book, there would be knowledge in it. Ibn Aoun said: I asked Ikrimah about that book, but he did not know it.[240]

Now that both Sunni and Shi'ah have unanimously recorded that 'Ali's Qur'an manuscript is arranged in order of revelation, the question is why would Ali produce this version of the Qur'an to the public when there is one in circulation and it is generally accepted by all the Muslims (even though some sahabah rejected it)? We have proven in previous chapters that sahabah had different manuscripts of the Qur'an [i.e Qur'an of same contents but different arrangements], and that at the time of the reign of Caliph Uthman, one version was officially produced and inaugurated while other manuscripts were burnt. Ali's version was not only chronological but also has tafsir (commentary) of each verse (according to other narrations).

Shi'ah gathered in their books of history that when Ali presented his Qur'an manuscript to the Caliph (Abu Bakr), they rejected it and rather called upon Zayd ibn Thabit to write their own. Imam Ali was reported to have kept that Quran manuscript and never brought it out again. It became personal property of the Ahl al-Bayt.

---

[240] Abdur-Rahman As-Suyuti, *Jāmi' Al-Ahadeeth* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr), vol. 3, pg. 330.

We also revealed in the previous chapter that Imam Ali told Talha ibn Ubaydillah that the Qur'an manuscript (written by Zayd ibn Thabit and later commissioned as state's official manuscript by 'Uthman) which was in circulation is correct and leads to paradise. Imam 'Ali told Talha, "If you adhere to what (i.e the Qur'an) you have (i.e in your posession), it will save you from hell and entered you into paradise." Had there been any problem with the Uthmanic edition, Ali would have challenged them on it. On the other hand, it was Ibn Abbas, Ibn Umar and Ibn Mas'ud and co. that faulted the Uthmanic edition as we have revealed previously. So, who really deserves to be accused of not believing in the Qur'an?

To further prove our point [that: Had there been any problem with the Uthmanic edition, Ali would have challenged them on it], Prophet specifically predicted and instructed Ali to fight for the tawil [interpretation] of the Qur'an after him.

Shaykh al-Albānī records:

عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال كنا جلوسا ننتظر رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم فخرج علينا من بعض بيوت نسائه قال فقمنا معه فانقطعت نعله فتخلف عليها علي يخصفها فمضى رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم ومضينا معه ثم قام ينتظره وقمنا معه فقال إن منكم من يقاتل على تأويل هذا القرآن كما قاتلت على تنزيله فاستشرفنا وفينا أبو بكر وعمر فقال لا ولكنه خاصف النعل يعني عليا رضي الله عنه قال فجئنا نبشره قال وكأنه قد سمعه.

صحيح على شرط مسلم.

Narrated Abū Sa'īd:

We were sitting, waiting for the Mesenger of Allāh, peace be upon him. Then he came to us from the room of one of his wives. So, we stood with him. But his shoe broke, and

he appointed 'Alī to stay behind to repair it. Then, the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, walked and we walked with him.

He (the Prophet) stood up, waiting for him (i.e Alī) and we stood with him. Then he said: "There is among you one who will fight over the tāwīl (right interpretation) of this Qur'ān, just as I fought over its tanzīl (revelation)."

Each of us wished it was him, and among us were Abū Bakr and 'Umar. But he (the Prophet) said: "No. He is only the repairer of the shoe" referring to 'Alī, may Allāh be pleased with him. We went to him (i.e 'Alī) to give him the good news. But he responded as though he had earlier heard it. (Sahīh on the conditions of Muslim).[241]

Therefore, there is no need for 'Ali to produce his own mus'haf of the Qur'an since the one in circulation is correct. The only problem during his reign was about correct interpretation of the Qur'an, and he fought over it as his master (peace be upon him and his progeny) fought over its tanzil (revelation).

Finally, contrary to the professor's claim that the Prophet and the companions arranged the Qur'an, the Sunni are of the official position that Qur'an was not compiled or arranged at the lifetime of the noble Prophet; rather, it was Abu Bakr and Umar via Zayd ibn Thabit who put the Qur'an into compilation. According to the Sunni accounts, 'Uthman ibn Affan relied on this compilation to unify the Muslim world on a single manuscript.

---

[241] Muhammad Nāsir al-Dīn al-Albānī, al-Silsilah al-Ahādīth al-Sahīhah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif), vol. 5, p. 639, # 2487

LEADERS BEFORE ALI IBN ABI TAALIB

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

ALI'S REMARKS OF THE SHEIKHAYN - WHO'S THE BEST OF THE UMMAH

Question 29:

It is an established fact and a peak of narrations (Mutawatir) that Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu makes so many public pronouncements in the Prophet's Mosque as follows: the best of this generation after the Noble Prophet is Abubakar, then Umar. Why did he (Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu) praise them? You can reply by saying it was dissimulation. Then why don't you all practice it? If you will engage in practicing dissimulation, it would have been better!

THE REPLY

Our Professor made three claims here [before advancing his question]:

- That Ali made many pronouncements publicly in the Prophet's Mosque
- That Abu Bakr and Umar (in order) were the best of this generation
- That the "many pronouncements" is mutawattir narration.

These are nothing but empty claims. On one hand, it is easier for non-academic and non-scientific work to make claim to anything like our Professor who had shown this over and over. On the other hand, an academic and scientific work must be able to substantiate its claim with convincing evidence. The Professor has repeatedly failed in this regard. For a fact, there is no reliable evidence to support the aforementioned claims. Even the closest evidence cannot stand the scrutiny and test of the Qur'an

and other authentic ahadith. Therefore, if these claims fall, the main question they erected will collapse instantly. In sha Allah, this chapter will leave no stone unturned to establish the truth by examining the three claims.

INVESTIGATIONS

Did Ali make ANY public pronouncement that Abu Bakr and Umar were the best of the Ummah? The answer is emphatic NO. Here, the claim of "many public pronouncements" which would be naturally interpreted as "mutawattir narration" does not even arise. However, there is one single [Ahad] Sunni report attributed to Ali ibn Abi Talib which seemed to have suggested the Professor's claim, but it is rather a private "pronouncement" and not public in the Prophet's Mosque.

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiya:

I asked my father (`Ali bin Abi Talib), "Who are the best people after Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him)?" He said, "Abu Bakr." I asked, "Who then?" He said, "Then `Umar." I was afraid he would say "Uthman, so I said, "Then you?" He said, "I am only an ordinary muslim.[242]

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ كَثِيرٍ، أَخْبَرَنَا سُفْيَانُ، حَدَّثَنَا جَامِعُ بْنُ أَبِي رَاشِدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو يَعْلَى، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ ابْنِ الْحَنَفِيَّةِ، قَالَ قُلْتُ لأَبِي أَىُّ النَّاسِ خَيْرٌ بَعْدَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ. قُلْتُ ثُمَّ مَنْ قَالَ ثُمَّ عُمَرُ. وَخَشِيتُ أَنْ يَقُولَ عُثْمَانُ قُلْتُ ثُمَّ أَنْتَ قَالَ مَا أَنَا إِلاَّ رَجُلٌ مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ.

---

[242] Sahih al-Bukhari 3671; In-book reference: Book 62, Hadith 0USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 57, Hadith 20 https://sunnah.com/urn/133020

This narration ascribed to Ali seemed to [further] establish the Sunni ideology of "Khulafau Rashideen [rightly guided caliphs]" in Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman in the pecking order as the best people of the Ummah after the Messenger of Allah. Interestingly, Ali did not even reckon with his own status. Some may interpret that as "humility." On the contrary, Caliph Umar revealed the thought of Ali on Abu Bakr and himself in a public gathering. Imam Muslim in a long narration document:

Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Asma ad-Dhuba'iy - Juwayriyya - Malik (ibn Anas) - (Ibn Shihaab) al-Zuhri - Malik ibn Auws: "...Then he (Yarfa') came again and said: What do you say about Ali and Abbas (who are present at the door)? Abbas said: Commander of the Faithful, decide (the dispute) between me and this sinful, treacherous, dishonest liar. The people (who were present) also said: Yes. Commander of the Faithful, do decide (the dispute) and have mercy on them....

قَالَ فَلَمَّا تُوُفِّيَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ أَنَا وَلِيُّ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَجِئْتُمَا تَطْلُبُ مِيرَاثَكَ مِنَ ابْنِ أَخِيكَ وَيَطْلُبُ هَذَا مِيرَاثَ امْرَأَتِهِ مِنْ أَبِيهَا فَقَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم : مَا نُورَثُ مَا تَرَكْنَا صَدَقَةٌ . فَرَأَيْتُمَاهُ كَاذِبًا آثِمًا غَادِرًا خَائِنًا وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ إِنَّهُ لَصَادِقٌ بَارٌّ رَاشِدٌ تَابِعٌ لِلْحَقِّ ثُمَّ تُوُفِّيَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ وَأَنَا وَلِيُّ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَوَلِيُّ أَبِي بَكْرٍ فَرَأَيْتُمَانِي كَاذِبًا آثِمًا غَادِرًا خَائِنًا وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ إِنِّي لَصَادِقٌ بَارٌّ رَاشِدٌ تَابِعٌ لِلْحَقِّ فَوَلِيتُهَا.

...'He (Umar) said: When the Messenger of Allah passed away, Abu Bakr said:" I am the successor of the Messenger of Allah. Both of you came to demand your shares from the property (left behind by the Messenger of Allah). (Referring to Hadrat Abbas), he said: You demanded your share from the property of your nephew, and he (referring to Ali) demanded a share on behalf of his wife from the

property of her father. Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him) said: The Messenger of Allah had said: "We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity." So both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest. And Allah knows that he was true, virtuous, well-guided and a follower of truth. When Abu Bakr passed away and (I have become) the successor of the Messenger of Allah and Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him), you thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest. And Allah knows that I am true, virtuous, well-guided and a follower of truth. I became the guardian of this property...[243] [244],

So, till the demise of Abu Bakr and reign of Umar, Ali used to think of them both as liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest persons. How will the Sunni reconcile this

---

[243] Sahih Muslim 1757 c; In-book reference : Book 32, Hadith 58; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 19, Hadith 4349; https://sunnah.com/muslim/32/58

[244]Some might ask that, "but why did Abbas initially used the same bad qualities for Ali?" The reply is that Hazrat Abbas and Imam Ali had no fight between them. They simply put up a show to pass a message across to Umar publicly which the later understood perfectly; hence, his words, "... ***so both of you thought him ... both of you thought me to be liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest***" using the very same wordings of Hazrat Abbas.

This isn't a polemic interpretation as a Sunni ace Imam interpreted almost the same. Imam Abdullah Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276 A. H) whom we agreed with in his thought writes: A man asked him: "O Aba Mohammad, do you know that Ali litigated with Abbas about Fadak to Abu Bakr?" He said: "Yes." The man said: "which one of the two was the oppressor?" He said: "neither of them was an oppressor." The man said: "Subhanallah! How could this be?" He said: "they both were like the two angels who litigated to Dawood (a.s)[Quran: 38:21-24], none of them was an oppressor, they both(i.e. the two angels) wanted to make him(i.e. Dawood a.s) realize his mistake and oppression, likewise these two wanted to make Abu Bakr know his mistake and oppression."

Source: Abdullah ibn Muslim al-Qutaybah, Tawil Mukhtalif Al-Hadeeth [Beirut: Maktaba al-Islami] (annotator: Muhammad Muhydeen al-Asfar), Pg. 98. https://archive.org/details/waq62864

"hidden" thought of Ali, which Caliph Umar knew and voiced out, with the other hadith ascribed to the same Ali that both of them were the best of the Ummah after the Messenger of Allah?

WHO IS THE BEST OF THIS UMMAH?

There are two categories of contradictory ahadith as regard the best of the Ummah in the testimonies of the sahabah. For brevity we present one each of these two categories.

First, Imam al-Bukhari gives us this view:

Narrated Ibn `Umar:

عَنِ ابْنِ عُمَرَ ـ رضى الله عنهما ـ قَالَ كُنَّا نُخَيِّرُ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ فِي زَمَنِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَنُخَيِّرُ أَبَا بَكْرٍ، ثُمَّ عُمَرَ بْنَ الْخَطَّابِ، ثُمَّ عُثْمَانَ بْنَ عَفَّانَ رضى الله عنهم

We used to compare the people as to who was better during the lifetime of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him). We used to regard Abu Bakr as the best, then `Umar, and then `Uthman.[245]

On the contrary, Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud gives us another account.

Imam Ahmad documents:

---

[245] Sahih al-Bukhari 3655; In-book reference : Book 62, Hadith 0; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 5, Book 57, Hadith 7 https://sunnah.com/urn/34120
Furthermore, Imam Bukhari [hadith 4240, 4241 and Tirmidhi 1609] even documents that Fatimah refused to speak to either Abu Bakr and Umar till she died, and Imam Ahmad [hadith 14] equally documents that Fatimah never believed in the saying of Abu Bakr that [The Messenger of Allah had said:" We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity]. How come the doyen of women of Paradise, the most truthful lady of the Ummah, had this attitude towards Abu Bakr if truly he was known to be the best of the Ummah?

Abd Allah (b. Muhammad b. Abd al-Aziz al-Baghwi) - my grandfather (Ahmad b. Muni al-Baghwi) - Abu Qatan – Shu'bah - Abu Ishaq - Abd Allah b. Yazid - Alqamah - Abd Allah b. Mas'ud:

ابن مسعود قال كنا نتحدث ان افضل اهل المدينة علي بن ابي طالب

We used to say that the overall best of the people of Madinah was Ali ibn Abi Talib.[246]

Comment: Its chain is authentic (Sahih).

This is a clear contradiction. For the sake of fairness, we do not want to dig the political and partisan reasons why this contradiction is apparent.

---

[246] Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Fadail al-Sahabah (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 1403 H)[annotator: Dr. Wasiyullah Muhammad Abbas], vol.2, p.646, #1097

PROPHET JOINS THE CONTROVERSY

As if the aforementioned categories of ahadith are not contradictory enough, there are other categories of ahadith ascribed to the Prophet that seem to go both sides, that is, favouring Abu Bakr on one side and Ali on the other side.

Imam Bukhari again takes the center stage. He documents:

Narrated `Amr bin Al-As:

حَدَّثَنَا مُعَلَّى بْنُ أَسَدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ بْنُ الْمُخْتَارِ، قَالَ خَالِدٌ الْحَذَّاءُ حَدَّثَنَا عَنْ أَبِي عُثْمَانَ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي عَمْرُو بْنُ الْعَاصِ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم بَعَثَهُ عَلَى جَيْشِ ذَاتِ السَّلاَسِلِ، فَأَتَيْتُهُ فَقُلْتُ أَىُّ النَّاسِ أَحَبُّ إِلَيْكَ قَالَ عَائِشَةُ فَقُلْتُ مِنَ الرِّجَالِ فَقَالَ أَبُوهَا قُلْتُ ثُمَّ مَنْ قَالَ ثُمَّ عُمَرُ بْنُ الْخَطَّابِ فَعَدَّ رِجَالاً

The Prophet (peace be upon him) deputed me to lead the Army of Dhat-as-Salasil. I came to him and said, "Which of MANKIND is the most beloved to you?" He said, "`Aisha." I asked, "Among the men?" He said, "Her father." I said, "Who then?" He said, "Then `Umar bin Al-Khattab." He then named other men.[247]

According to this narration, Umm al-Mu'mineen Aisha was (actually) the most beloved of mankind to the Prophet. Then, interestingly, among men was his father. But the narration says "of mankind."?!

On the contrary, Imam al-Tirmidhi documents:

Narrated Anas bin Malik:

There was a bird with the Prophet (peace be upon him), so he said: O Allah, send to me the most beloved of Your

---

[247] Sahih al-Bukhari 3662; In-book reference: Book 62, Hadith 0; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 5, Book 57, Hadith 14; https://sunnah.com/urn/34190

creatures to eat this bird with me. So 'Ali came and ate with him.[248]

حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ بْنُ وَكِيعٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُوسَى، عَنْ عِيسَى بْنِ عُمَرَ، عَنِ السُّدِّيِّ، عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ، قَالَ كَانَ عِنْدَ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم طَيْرٌ فَقَالَ اللَّهُمَّ ائْتِنِي بِأَحَبِّ خَلْقِكَ إِلَيْكَ يَأْكُلُ مَعِي هَذَا الطَّيْرَ . فَجَاءَ عَلِيٌّ فَأَكَلَ مَعَهُ

Grade: Hasan

Imam Hakim also documents this hadith in a more elaborate version and comments on it saying:

هذا حديث صحيح على شرط الشيخين ، ولم يخرجاه

This hadith is Sahih (authentic) upon the conditions of the two Sheiks (Bukhari and Muslim), but they did not document it.[249]

These are no doubt other contradictory ahadith.

AISHAH'S TESTIFICATION

Since it is not tenable to reconcile the context of those contradictory ahadith (and their likes), the discovery of Umm al-Mu'mineen Aisha solves the quagmire.

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 H) states:

Ahmad, Abu Dawud and al-Nasai have recorded with a Sahih [authentic] Chain from Nu'man b. Bashir:

---

[248] Al-Tirmidhi, Jami' sahih Tirmidhi, English reference : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3721; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4087; https://sunnah.com/urn/636010

[249] Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Abdullah al-Haakim an-Nisaburi, Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain (Dar al-Kitab al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut), vol. 3, page 141 – 142, hadith 248/4650

وأخرج أحمد وأبو داود والنسائي بسند صحيح عن النعمان بن بشير
قال استأذن أبو بكر على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فسمع
صوت عائشة عاليا وهي تقول والله لقد علمت أن عليا أحب أليك
من أبي

Abu Bakr sought permission to enter the house of the Prophet, peace be upon him, and heard the voice of Aishah, very loud, and she was saying (to the prophet), **"I HAVE KNOWN THAT ALI IS MORE BELOVED TO YOU THAN MY FATHER.**[250]

Imam Ahmad records more details:

Abd Allah (b. Ahmad) - my father (Ahmad b. Hanbal) - Abu Na'im - Yunus - al-'Ayzar b. Hurayth - al-Nu'man b. Bashir:

Abu Bakr sought the permission of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, to enter his house, and he heard the voice of Aishah, very loud. She was saying, **"I SWEAR BY ALLAH, I HAVE DISCOVERED THAT ALI IS MORE BELOVED TO YOU THAN MY FATHER AND ME."** She said it twice or thrice. So, Abu Bakr sought permission (again) and entered, and reached for her, and said, "O daughter of such-and-such woman! Did I hear you raising your voice upon the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him?[251]

---

[250] Fath al-Bari sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Marifah Li al-Taba'ah wa al-Nashr, 2nd edition), vol.7, p.19

[251] Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shuaib al-Ar'naut], vol.4, p.275, #18444. https://islamweb.net/ar/library/index.php?page=bookcontents&flag=1&bk_no=6&ID=17696

حدثنا أبو نعيم حدثنا يونس حدثنا العيزار بن حريث قال قال النعمان بن بشير قال استأذن أبو بكر على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فسمع صوت عائشة عاليا وهي تقول والله لقد عرفت أن عليا أحب إليك من أبي ومني مرتين أو ثلاثا فاستأذن أبو بكر فدخل فأهوى إليها فقال يا بنت فلانة ألا أسمعك ترفعين صوتك على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Shaykh al-Ar'naut says: Its Chain is Hasan (Good)

So, the truth was that Ali ibn Abi Talib was the most beloved of Allah and His Messenger but for certain reason(s), the noble Prophet had to keep this truth secretive and probably even displayed the opposites. This is what Umm al-Mu'mineen Aishah discovered and got severely angered with. So, if Abu Bakr did not even get closer to march Ali, how would others like Umar and Uthman could possibly be ranked above Ali ibn Abi Talib? Indeed, such ranks were politically and polemically motivated.

A MAN OF PROPHET'S SIMILARITY

In terms of ilm (knowledge), shujah (bravery), zuhd (asceticism) etc etc, who from amongst the sahabah can march Ali ibn Abi Talib?[252] Ali was personally trained and shaped by the Prophet right from the cradle till Prophet died. This is perhaps what made the Prophet declared:

"... Indeed 'Ali is from me, and I am from him..."[253]

... ... إن عليا مني وأنا منه

Imam Nasai further documents:

---

[252] Kindly read the book "Ali, the best of the sahabah" by Mar'hum Toyyib Olawuyi. The pdf is available with the same title on the internet.

[253] Al-Tirmidhi, Jami' sahih Tirmidhi, English reference : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3712; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4077; https://sunnah.com/urn/735910

أخبرنا العباس بن محمد قال حدثنا الأحوص بن جواب قال حدثنا يونس بن أبي إسحاق عن أبي إسحاق عن زيد بن يثيع عن أبي ذر قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم : لينتهين بنو وليعة أو لأبعثن إليهم رجلا كنفسي ينفذ فيهم أمري فيقتل المقاتلة ويسبي الذرية فما راعني إلا وكف عمر في حجزتي من خلفي من يعني فقلت ما إياك يعني ولا صاحبك قال فمن يعني قلت خاصف النعل قال وعلي يخصف نعلا

Al-'Abbas b. Muhammad – al-Ahwas b. Jawab – Yunus b. Abi Ishaq – Abu Ishaq – Zayd b. Yathi' – Abu Dharr:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, "If the Banu Wali'ah do not desist, I will appoint over them a man who is exactly like myself to implement my command among them. So, he will execute the combatants and take the offspring as war captives." I had not even moved when 'Umar held my cloth and asked, "Who is he referring to?" I replied, "He is not referring to you or your companion (i.e. Abu Bakr)." He said, "In that case, who is he referring to?" So, I said, "(He is) referring to the one repairing the shoe." And 'Ali was repairing a shoe.[254]

'Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) writes about this report:

I say: **This chain, all its narrators are thiqah (trustworthy).** However, Abu Ishaq – and he is al-Sabi'i – was a mudalis, and he became confused, and his son Yunus narrated from him after he had become confused.[255]

---

[254] Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Ahmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasai, Sunan al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Dr. 'Abd al-Ghaffar Sulayman al-Bandari and Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan], vol. 5, p. 127, # 8457

[255] Muhammad Nasir al-Din b. al-Hajj Nuh al-Albani, Silsilah al-Ahadith al-Ḍa'ifah wa al-Mawdhu'ah wa Atharihah alSayyiah fi al-

This is rather a ploy by Sheikh al-Albani to cast doubt on this authentic report. Yes, it is true that Abu Ishaq was a mudalis but his tadlis is never of harmful grade. Infact, Imam Muslim accepted him in his sahih,[256] Imam Ahmad,[257] al-Tirmidhi and even al-Albani[258] himself also accepted him grading his an'an chains as authentic. So, why trying to cast a shadow over the hadith?

Imam 'Abd al-Razzaq (d. 211 H) gives another chain for the hadith:

'Abd al-Razzaq – Ma'mar – Ibn Tawus – his father – al-Muṭalib b. 'Abd Allah b. Hanṭab:

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, when the delegation of (Banu) Thaqif came (to him), said (to them), "You either submit or I appoint a man from me or who is my similarity, and he will hit your necks and take your offspring as war prisoners, and will confiscate your properties." So, 'Umar said, "I swear by Allah, I never wished for power except on that day. I volunteered for it, wishing that he would say, "This is the one". But, he instead looked towards 'Ali, and held his hand and said, "This is the one. This is the one."[259]

Ummah (Riyadh: Dar al-Ma'arif; 1st edition, 1412 H), vol. 10, p. 677, # 4960

[256] Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad Abd al-Baqi], vol. 4, p. 2050, hadith 2661 (29)

[257] Abu Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 118, hadith 21156

[258] Abu Abd Allah Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 118, hadith 21156

[259] Abu Bakr 'Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-Ṣa'nani, al-Musannaf [annotator: Habib al-Rahman al-A'zami], vol. 11, p. 226, # 20389 (24).

أخبرنا عبد الرزاق ، عن معمر ، عن ابن طاوس ، عن أبيه ، عن المطلب بن عبد الله بن حنطب ، قال : قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لوفد ثقيف حين جاءوا : لتسلمن أو لنبعثن رجلا مني - أو قال : مثل نفسي - فليضربن أعناقكم ، وليسبين ذراريكم ، وليأخذن أموالكم ، فقال عمر : فوالله ما تمنيت الإمارة إلا يومئذ ، جعلت أنصب صدري رجاء أن يقول هو هذا ، قال : فالتفت إلى علي فأخذ بيده ثم قال : هو هذا ، هو هذا

'Allamah al-Albani comments about this report:

قلت: وهذا إسناد صحيح؛ ولكنه مرسل.

I say: This chain is sahih. However, it is mursal.

Obviously, this is a perfect shahid for the first report. Lastly, our Lord in His glorious book says to His Messenger:

"And whoso disputeth with thee concerning him, after the knowledge which hath come unto thee, say (unto him): Come! We will summon our sons and your sons, and our women and your women, and OURSELVES and yourselves, then we will pray humbly (to our Lord) and (solemnly) invoke the curse of Allah upon those who lie."[260]

فَمَنْ حَاجَّكَ فِيهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ فَقُلْ تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَأَبْنَاءَكُمْ وَنِسَاءَنَا وَنِسَاءَكُمْ وَأَنْفُسَنَا وَأَنْفُسَكُمْ ثُمَّ نَبْتَهِلْ فَنَجْعَلْ لَعْنَتَ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِينَ

[260] Surah Aal-Imran, verse 61

Imam Muslim[261] and Imam al-Hakim[262] both documented in authentic reports indicating that "ourselves (anfusana)" in the verse was Ali ibn Abi Talib while Fatimah was selected by the Prophet as "our women" and al-Hasan and al-Husein were "our sons."

If according to the Qur'an and authentic ahadith 'Ali Ibn Abi Talib is the "self" of the Prophet and someone exactly like him, then what is all these comparison of others with Ali about? Indeed, those ahadith about Abu Bakr being the best after the Prophet were nothing but polemic and politically influenced fabrications.

---

[261] Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj, Sahih Muslim – Arabic-English version (Riyadh: Darussalam) [annotator: Hafiz Abu Tahir Zubair Ali Za'i], vol. 6, p. 263 - 264, hadith 6220 (32)

[262] Kitab al-Ma'rifah 'Ulum al-Hadith [Beirut: Manshurah Dar al-Afaq al-Hadith, 4th Edition, 1400 H], p. 50

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

WHERE WAS THE PROPHET BURIED?

Question 30:

Why was the Noble Prophet buried in the room of an unbeliever in your creed and alongside those whom you regard as unbelievers? Under your doctrine, Pharaoh is better than these two persons (Abu Bakr and Umar). Why was the Prophet not protected against this evil? In this world, they were his most intimate friends, and presently they are still the closest and most intimate to him. Yet you believe they will not be together on the Day of Resurrection. Why should Allah make them this close?

Where was Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, when the Prophet was buried in Aisha's room? He should have discouraged it and never let it happen! Or was his bravery in decline during the death of the Noble Prophet?

THE REPLY

Following are claims of our Professor:

- In Shi'i creed, Aisha was an unbeliever
- In Shi'i creed, Abu Bakr and Umar were unbelievers
- Prophet was buried inside Aishah's room

Therefore, the main question was why did Ali allows the burial of the Prophet inside the room of an "unbeliever," and why did he also allow the two "unbelievers" to be buried beside the Prophet?

BURIAL AND GRAVE OF THE PROPHET

First, the noble Prophet [peace and blessings be upon him and his progeny] was not buried in the room of Umm al-Mu'minin Aisha as the Professor claims. He was buried in his own room. Ahlu Sunnah's confusion or assumption

stem from one of their ahadith which states that Prophet was being attended to in the room of Aisha during the days of his sickness that resulted in his death.

Imam Muslim documents:

A'isha.reported:

It was in the house of Maimuna that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) first fell ill. He asked permission from his wives to stay in her (A'isha) house during his illness. They granted him permission. She (A'isha) narrated: He (the Holy Prophet) went out (for prayer) with his hand over al-Fadl b. Abbas and on the other hand there was another person and (due to weakness) his feet dragged on the earth. Ubaidullah said: I narrated this hadith to the son of Abbas (Abdullah b. Abbas) and he said: Do you know who the man was whose name 'Aisha did not mention? It was Ali.[263]

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ رَافِعٍ، وَعَبْدُ بْنُ حُمَيْدٍ، - وَاللَّفْظُ لاِبْنِ رَافِعٍ - قَالاَ حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ، أَخْبَرَنَا مَعْمَرٌ، قَالَ قَالَ الزُّهْرِيُّ وَأَخْبَرَنِي عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عُتْبَةَ، أَنَّ عَائِشَةَ، أَخْبَرَتْهُ قَالَتْ، أَوَّلُ مَا اشْتَكَى رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فِي بَيْتِ مَيْمُونَةَ فَاسْتَأْذَنَ أَزْوَاجَهُ أَنْ يُمَرَّضَ فِي بَيْتِهَا وَأَذِنَّ لَهُ - قَالَتْ - فَخَرَجَ وَيَدُ لَهُ عَلَى الْفَضْلِ بْنِ عَبَّاسٍ وَيَدُ لَهُ عَلَى رَجُلٍ آخَرَ وَهُوَ يَخُطُّ بِرِجْلَيْهِ فِي الأَرْضِ . فَقَالَ عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ فَحَدَّثْتُ بِهِ ابْنَ عَبَّاسٍ فَقَالَ أَتَدْرِي مَنِ الرَّجُلُ الَّذِي لَمْ تُسَمِّ عَائِشَةُ هُوَ عَلِيٌّ .

However, when the noble Messenger died from the illness, he was moved away from Bibi Aisha's room. Imam Abu Dawud documents:

It was narrated that Aishah said:

---

[263] Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj, Sahih Muslim – Arabic-English version (Riyadh: Darussalam) [annotator: Hafiz Abu Tahir Zubair Ali Za'i], vol. 1, p. 529 - 530, hadith 937 (91)

"The Verse of stoning and of breastfeeding an adult ten times was revealed, and the paper was with me under my pillow. When the Messenger of Allah died, we were preoccupied with his death, and a tame sheep got in and ate it."[264]

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو سَلَمَةَ، يَحْيَى بْنُ خَلَفٍ حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الأَعْلَى، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ إِسْحَاقَ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي بَكْرٍ، عَنْ عَمْرَةَ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، . وَعَنْ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنِ الْقَاسِمِ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، قَالَتْ لَقَدْ نَزَلَتْ آيَةُ الرَّجْمِ وَرَضَاعَةُ الْكَبِيرِ عَشْرًا وَلَقَدْ كَانَ فِي صَحِيفَةٍ تَحْتَ سَرِيرِي فَلَمَّا مَاتَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ـ صلى الله عليه وسلم ـ وَتَشَاغَلْنَا بِمَوْتِهِ دَخَلَ دَاجِنٌ فَأَكَلَهَا .

Grade: Hasan (sound)

Fact one: It is not possible for a tame sheep to burst in and eat the said paper had it been the body of the Prophet was being washed and shrouded in Aisha's room. Therefore, he was not in her room at the time of death. Imam Jarir Tabari gives the account of the Prophet's final burial. He documents:

Ibn Humayd - Salamah - Muhammad b. Ishaq - Husayn b. Abd 'Allah - Ikrimah, freedman of Ibn Abbas - Abd 'Allah ibn Abbas:

Abu Ubaydah b. al-Jarrah and Abu Talhah Zayd b. Sahl were the two men in [Madinah]...

After the preparations for the Messenger of Allah's burial had been completed on Tuesday, he was laid upon HIS BED in his house. The Muslims had disagreed about the

---

[264] Sunan Abi Dawud, English reference: Vol. 3, Book 9, Hadith 1944; Arabic reference: Book 9, Hadith 2020; https://sunnah.com/urn/1320210

place of of his burial. Some said that they should bury him in his mosque while the others said that [they should bury him] with his companions [in al-Baqi]. Abu Bakr said, "I have heard the Messenger of Allah saying that no Prophet died but he was buried where he died, " so the bed on which he died was removed, and a grave was dug beneath it..."[265]

حدثنا ابن حميد قال حدثنا سلمة عن محمد بن إسحاق عن حسين بن عبد الله عن عكرمة مولى ابن عباس عن عبد الله بن عباس قال لما أرادوا أن يحفروا لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وكان أبو عبيدة بن الجراح....

فلما فرغ من جهاز رسول الله يوم الثلاثاء وضع على سريره في بيته ... وقد كان المسلمون اختلفوا في دفنه فقال قائل ندفنه في مسجده وقال قائل يدفن مع أصحابه فقال أبو بكر إني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول ما قبض نبي إلا يدفن حيث قبض فرفع فراش رسول الله الذي توفى عليه فحفر له تحته ودخل الناس على رسول الله يصلون عليه أرسالا حتى إذا فرغ الرجال أدخل النساء حتى إذا فرغ النساء أدخل الصبيان ثم أدخل العبيد ولم يؤم الناس على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أحد ثم دفن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من وسط الليل ليلة الأربعاء.

---

[265] Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari, Tarikh Tabari: Tarikh al-Rasul wa al-muluk [Dar al-Ma'arifah, Cairo] (annotator: Muhammad Abu al-Fadhl Ibrahim) vol. 3, pg. 213

Fact two: Prophet died in his room and was buried in the same place. This clearly suggested he was (later) moved away from Aisha's room and back to his room.

Furthermore, after the burial of the noble Prophet, people used to do ziyarat to his grave singly or in group. For example, al-Hafiz al-Darimi documents:

Abu Al-Nu'man narrated to us, Sa'eed ibn Zayb narrated to us, Amr ibn Malik Al-Nikri narrated to us, Abu'l-Jawza Aws ibn Abd-Allah who said:

The people of Madinah were faced with a severe drought. They complained to Aisha who said: Look at the grave of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and make an opening facing the sky so that there will be no barrier between him and the sky. They did that, then it rained until the plants grew and the camels grew exceedingly fat, and it was called the year of the exceedingly fat animals."[266]

حدثنا أبو النعمان حدثنا سعيد بن زيد حدثنا عمرو بن مالك النكري حدثنا أبو الجوزاء أوس بن عبد الله قال قحط أهل المدينة قحطا شديدا فشكوا إلى عائشة فقالت انظروا قبر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فاجعلوا منه كوى إلى السماء حتى لا يكون بينه وبين السماء سقف قال ففعلوا فمطرنا مطرا حتى نبت العشب وسمنت الإبل حتى تفتقت من الشحم فسمي عام الفتق

Footnote: Its narrators are trustworthy.

Imam al-Hakim also documents a scene where Abu Ayub al-Ansari, a sahabi, visited the grave of the Prophet lying down close to the grave and Marwan questioned his action to which he replied:

---

[266] Hafiz Abu Muhammad al-Darimi, Musnad Al-Darimi Al-Maruf Sunan Al-Darimi (Dar al-Ma'ani Linashr wa Tawzih, 1st Edition) [annotator: Husein Salim Asad] Vol. 1, Pg. # 227, H. # 93.

جِئْتُ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَلَمْ آتِ الْحَجَرَ

"I have come to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and not to a stone...[267]

And al-Hakim and Dhahabi say about the narration: This is an authentic hadith but they (Bukhari and Muslim) did not document it.

Fact Three: How is it possible for this kind of Ziyaraat (visitations) to take place had the grave was inside the room of Bibi Aisha? Where is the maximum privacy Allah has instructed the believers to give the wives of the Prophet?

O you who believe! Do not enter the houses[268] of the Prophet unless permission is given to you for a meal... and when you ask of them (the wives of the Prophet) any goods, ask of them from behind a curtain..."[269]

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَدْخُلُوا بُيُوتَ النَّبِيِّ إِلَّا أَن يُؤْذَنَ لَكُمْ إِلَى طَعَامٍ غَيْرَ نَاظِرِينَ إِنَاهُ ... وَإِذَا سَأَلْتُمُوهُنَّ مَتَاعًا فَاسْأَلُوهُنَّ مِن وَرَاءِ حِجَابٍ ذَٰلِكُمْ أَطْهَرُ لِقُلُوبِكُمْ وَقُلُوبِهِنَّ...

Going by these facts, it is a desperate and unthoughtful claim that Prophet's grave was inside Bibi Aisha (or any of his wives') room.

Fact Four: It is known that Abu Bakr and Umar were buried beside the grave of the Prophet. How is it possible for three graves to be inside a room while Bibi Aisha

---

[267] Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Abdullah al-Haakim an-Nisaburi, Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain (Dar al-Kitab al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut), vol. 4, page 560, hadith 8571

[268] Houses of the Prophet: means rooms of his wives.

[269] Surah Ahzab: 53

continues to live in it? There is no record she evacuated her living room for other room at any point in time.

DESPERATIONS

Of course, this strange and desperate thought was advanced in the hope to preach "great affection" that the Prophet had for Aisha – he requested to be taken to Aisha's room, died and buried there. Fact is that Ahlu Sunnah are extra desperate to create status for Bibi Aisha. They argue she was the most beloved wife of the Prophet but on the contrary, Lady Aisha confessed the Prophet's undying love for Hadhrat Khadijah.

Imam Bukhari documents:

Narrated `Aisha:

I did not feel jealous of any of the wives of the Prophet (peace be upon him) as much as I did of Khadija though I did not see her, but the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to mention her very often, and when ever he slaughtered a sheep, he would cut its parts and send them to the women friends of Khadija. When I sometimes said to him, "(You treat Khadija in such a way) as if there is no woman on earth except Khadija," he would say, "Khadija was such-and-such[270] , and from her I had children."[271]

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو سَلَمَةَ، يَحْيَى بْنُ خَلَفٍ حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الأَعْلَى، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ إِسْحَاقَ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي بَكْرٍ، عَنْ عَمْرَةَ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، . وَعَنْ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنِ الْقَاسِمِ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، قَالَتْ لَقَدْ نَزَلَتْ آيَةُ الرَّجْمِ وَرَضَاعَةُ الْكَبِيرِ عَشْرًا وَلَقَدْ كَانَ فِي صَحِيفَةٍ تَحْتَ سَرِيرِي فَلَمَّا

---

[270] In other hadith sources, the part "such and such" was "she believed in me when others rejected me."

[271] Sahih al-Bukhari hadith 3818; In-book reference: Book 63, Hadith 44; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 58, Hadith 166 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/63/44

مَاتَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ـ صلى الله عليه وسلم ـ وَتَشَاغَلْنَا بِمَوْتِهِ دَخَلَ دَاجِنٌ فَأَكَلَهَا

Truth was even that Aisha used to be jealous of other wives only that the jealous was much for lady Khadijah.

At other time, the Ahlu Sunnah will argue that Lady Aisha was the only virgin the Prophet had married. Lady Maryam al-Qibtiyyah, the mother of Ibrahim, was also a virgin. Besides, is being a virgin a merit? About Lady Aisha and Lady Hafsa in particular and other wives, when they ganged up against the Prophet, Allah says:

If you both turn to Allah in repentance, then (it is better for you for) indeed your hearts are already inclined ...[272]

Maybe, his Lord, if he divorced you, will give him in your place wives better than you, (who are) submissive, faithful, obedient, penitent, adorers, fasters, widows and virgins.[273]

The truth is that the noble Prophet tried to maintain balance, justice and love amongst his wives without infringing the rights of any, contrary to the Ahlu Sunnah's desperation[274] that Aisha was loved most by the Prophet. Ibn Majah documents:

---

[272] Imam Ibn al-Jawzi (d.597H) has this exegesis:
"Then He (Allah) addresses Aisha and Hafsah, saying: {If you both repent to Allah}, meaning from helping each other against the Messenger of Allah to hurt him. {**For your hearts have deviated**} Ibn Abbas said, "**They deviated, and deviated from the Truth.**" Mujahid said, "We used to consider His words, the Almighty {For your hearts have deviated} has something easy until we found it in the recitation of Ibn Mas'ud as: {for your hearts have deviated (zaghat)." **Source**: Muhammad al-Jawzi al-Qurshi al-Baghdadi, Zad al-Masir fi Ilm al-Tafsir (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1407H), vol. 8, p.52}

[273] Surah al-Tahrim: 4 – 5

[274] Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated`Urwafrom`Aisha:

The wives of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) were in two groups. One group consisted of `Aisha, Hafsa, Safiyya and Sauda; and the other group consisted of Um Salama and the other wives of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him). The Muslims knew that Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) loved `Aisha, so if any of them had a gift and wished to give to Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him), he would delay it, till Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) had come to `Aisha's home and then he would send his gift to Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) in her home. The group of Um Salama discussed the matter together and decided that Um Salama should request Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) to tell the people to send their gifts to him in whatever wife's house he was. Um Salama told Allah's Messenger peace be upon him) of what they had said, but he did not reply. Then they (those wives) asked Um Salama about it. She said, "He did not say anything to me." They asked her to talk to him again. She talked to him again when she met him on her day, but he gave no reply. When they asked her, she replied that he had given no reply. They said to her, "Talk to him till he gives you a reply." When it was her turn, she talked to him again. He then said to her, 'Do not hurt me regarding Aisha, as the Divine Inspirations do not come to me on any of the beds except that of Aisha.' On that Um Salama said, "I repent to Allah for hurting you." Then the group of Um Salama called Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and sent her to Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) to say to him, "**Your wives request to treat them and the daughter of Abu Bakr on equal terms**." Then Fatima conveyed the message to him. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "O my daughter! Don't you love whom I love?" She replied in the affirmative and returned and told them of the situation. They requested her to go to him again but she refused. They then sent Zainab bint Jahsh who went to him and used harsh words saying, "Your wives request you to treat them and the daughter of Ibn Abu Quhafa on equal terms." On that she raised her voice and abused `Aisha to her face so much so that Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) looked at `Aisha to see whether she would retort. `Aisha started replying to Zainab till she silenced her. The Prophet (peace be upon him) then looked at `Aisha and said, "She is really the daughter of Abu Bakr."

Source: Sahih al-Bukhari 2581; In-book reference: Book 51, Hadith 16; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 3, Book 47, Hadith 755; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/51/16

It was narrated that Aishah said:

"The Messenger of Allah used to divide his time equally among his wives, then he would say O Allah, this is what I am doing with regard to that which is within my control, so do not hold me accountable for that which is under Your control and is beyond my control."[275]

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو بَكْرِ بْنُ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ، وَمُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى، قَالاَ حَدَّثَنَا يَزِيدُ بْنُ هَارُونَ، أَنْبَأَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ سَلَمَةَ، عَنْ أَيُّوبَ، عَنْ أَبِي قِلاَبَةَ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ يَزِيدَ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، قَالَتْ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ـ صلى الله عليه وسلم ـ يَقْسِمُ بَيْنَ نِسَائِهِ فَيَعْدِلُ ثُمَّ يَقُولُ اللَّهُمَّ هَذَا فِعْلِي فِيمَا أَمْلِكُ فَلاَ تَلُمْنِي فِيمَا تَمْلِكُ وَلاَ أَمْلِكُ .

Grade: Sahih (authentic)

The Sunni desperation even reached another level when it is said that Prophet died on Bibi Aisha's laps or bosom[276] but on the contrary, Umm al-Mu'minin Umm Salama

---

How can this narration be attributed to the Prophet of Allah?

[275] Sunan Ibn Majah, English reference: Vol. 3, Book 9, Hadith 1971; Arabic reference: Book 9, Hadith 2047 https://www.sunnah.com/urn/1262900

[276] Imam al-Bukhari documents: Narrated Al-Aswad:

In the presence of `Aisha some people mentioned that the Prophet (SAWS) had appointed `Ali by will as his successor. `Aisha said, "When did he appoint him by will? Verily **when he died he was resting against my chest (or said: in my lap)** and he asked for a wash-basin and then collapsed while in that state, and I could not even perceive that he had died, so when did he appoint him by will?"

Source: Sahih al-Bukhari 2741; In-book reference: Book 55, Hadith 4; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 4, Book 51, Hadith 4; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/51/16

swore by Allah that "Ali was the last person to be with the Prophet before his death."[277]

And of course, the last desperation was the claim that Prophet was buried inside Bibi Aisha's room.

WERE THEY KUFFAR [UNBELIEVERS]?

The initial allegation of the Professor reads:

Why was the Noble prophet buried in the room of an unbeliever in your creed/doctrine and together with whom you regard as unbelievers? Under your creed, Pharaoh is better than these two persons (Abubakar & Umar).

First, the Shi'ah did not regard Bibi Aisha and the two Caliphs (Abu Bakr and Umar, and Uthman) as "unbelievers." Interestingly, the Professor even defined the "kufr" when he says, "Under your creed, Pharaoh is better than these two persons (Abu Bakr and Umar)."

---

[277] Imam al-Hakim documents: Umm Salamah narrates: "**By the One by Whom alone do I swear**, `Ali was the closest to the Messenger of Allah (pbuh) upon his death. We [she and Ali] visited him one afternoon, and he happily and repeatedly said: `Ali has come! `Ali has come! Fatima inquired whether `Ali had been sent on an errand. Later on, `Ali came again, and I thought that probably he needed to have some privacy with the Prophet (peace be upon him); so, we came out and sat at the door. I was closer to the door. The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) bent his head over `Ali and started talking to him confidentially, addressing him affectionately, till he passed away; so, **`Ali was the last person to be with him before his death.**" Al-Hakim comments: This hadith is Sahih upon the standard of the two sheiks

Al-Dhahabi concurs: Sahih

Source: Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, al-Mustadrak 'alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H) [annotator: Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā], vol. 3, p. 149, hadith 4671 (269)

Second, for a fact, Pharaoh's kufr (disbelief) was a rejection of Allah as well as the two Prophets of Allah sent to him. This was never the case with the two Caliphs. Apparently, they died as Muslims who at least professed the belief in Allah and His Messenger openly, and never rejected it. This is the fundamental belief of the Shi'ah regarding the Caliphs and Aisha.

However, the "kufr (negation)" the Shi'a accused the Caliphs and some of the sahabah of after the demise of the Prophet was in their rejection of the Wilayah [leadership] of Ali ibn Abi Talib. This is what makes the Ahlu Sunnah hell-bent, argue and re-interpret that Prophet did not mean "successor" when he said to Ali, "you are my Khalifah over every believer after me," or "you are my Wali over every believer after me," or "whosoever I am his Mawla, then Ali is his Mawla." Should Ahlu Sunnah accept the meaning of these ahadith to be successor after the Prophet, then the kufr (rejection) of Abu Bakr, Umar and others in the obligatory command of Allah and His Prophet pertaining to the Wilayah [leadership] of Ali is established.

One of the greatest Sunni scholars, Sheikh al-Islam al-Imam al-Ghazali (d. 505 H) writes:

واجمع الجماهير علي متن الحديث من خطبته في يوم عيد غدير خم باتفاق الجميع وهو يقول: «من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه» فقال عمر بخ بخ يا أبا الحسن لقد أصبحت مولاي ومولي كل مولي فهذا تسليم ورضي وتحكيم ثم بعد هذا غلب الهوي تحب الرياسة وحمل عمود الخلافة وعقود النبوة وخفقان الهوي في قعقعة الرايات واشتباك ازدحام الخيول وفتح الأمصار وسقاهم كأس الهوي فعادوا إلي الخلاف الأول: فنبذوه وراء ظهورهم واشتروا به ثمناً قليلا. ولما مات رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال قبل وفاته : (ائتوا بداوة لأزيل لكم إشكال الأمر .. وأذكر من المستحق لها بعدى) فقال عمر دعوا الرجل فإنه ليهجر

The people and scholars agree upon the context of the narration of the sermon on the day of Ghadir Khum in which the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, [Whoever I am the Mawla then Ali is his Mawla]. Then Umar Ibn Khattab said: Congratulations! Oh Abal Hasan, you have become my Mawla and the Mawla of every believer.

This shows his (Umar) submission and acceptance and confirmation (of Ali's Mawla-ship). However, after that, he (i.e Umar) was defeated by his desire and love of power in flag of leadership, and he was dominated by desire, and the desire to hold the flag of Caliphate, and the joy to open and conquer states, and by that they (i.e Umar and others) reverted to the early phase, they dispensed with the agreement (of Ghadir Khum) and sold it at a low price. And also, the Prophet (peace be upon him) in his last illness before his death said: "Bring me a tablet and ink-pot, so that I may write for you a document by following which you will never go astray" whereupon Umar said: "Don't bring it, the man is talking nonsense."[278]

Also, Imam Sibt b. Jawzi (d. 654 H) also quoted the exact words of Imam al-Ghazali after making reference to his book:

وذكر أبو حامد الغزالى فى كتاب (سر العالمين) و كشف ما فى الدارين الفاظا تشبه هذا فقال قال رسول صلى الله عليه وسلم لعلى يوم غدير خم من ...

And Abu Haamid al-Ghazali mentioned in the book (Sirr al-Alamayn) wa kashf ma fi ad-Darayn words like this: He said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) says to Ali on the day of Ghadir ...[279]

---

[278] Majmu'a Rasaa'il al-Imam al-Ghazali (Maktabah al-Tawkifiyah, Cairo-Egypt) [annotator: Ibrahim Amin Muhammad], page 483

[279] Sibt al-Hafiz Abi al-Faraj Abd ar-Rahman ibn al-Jawzi, *Tadhkirat Ul-Khawa'is* [Maktab al-Iskandariyah], pg.79.

And indeed, the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) had foretold what would happen after his demise in general term. For example, he said to Ali ibn Abi Talib that the Ummah will betray him.

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403H) documents:

Abu Hafs Umar b. Ahmad al-Jamhi - Ali b. Abd al-Aziz - Amr b. Awn - Hushaym – Isma'il b. Salim - Abu Idris al-Awdi - Ali, may Allah be pleased with him:

Verily, part of what the Prophet, peace be upon him, told me is that the Ummah would soon betray me after him."[280]

حدثنا : أبو حفص عمر بن أحمد الجمحي بمكة ، ثنا : علي بن عبد العزيز ، ثنا : عمرو بن عون ، ثنا : هشيم ، عن إسماعيل بن سالم ، عن أبي إدريس الأودي ، عن علي ، قال : إن مما عهد إلي النبي (ص) أن الأمة ستغدر بي بعده

Imam al-Hakim comments:

هذا حديث صحيح الاسناد ، ولم يخرجاه

This hadith has an authentic chain but they (Bukhari and Muslim) did not document it.

Imam Dhahabi also comments: Sahih (authentic).

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani also documents:

Al-Fadl, Abu Na'im - Fitr b. Khalifah - Habib b. Abi Thabit – Tha'labah b. Yazid:

سمعت عليا ، يقول على المنبر : والله إنه لعهد النبي الأمي إلي : إن هذه الأمة ستغدر بي

---

[280] Hakim al-Naysapuri, Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihayn (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411H) [annotator: Mustafa Abd al-Qadir 'Ata], vol. 3, p. 150, #4676; Imam Hakim further document this hadith in vol. 3, p. 153, #4686.

I heard Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, saying: "I swear by Allah, verily, the Umm Prophet, peace be upon him, told me: "They (the Ummah) will soon betray you after me.[281]

And specifically, to Abu Bakr and few others, the noble Prophet was reported to have said he did not know what they will do after him.

Imam Malik documents:

Yahya related to me from Malik from Abu'n-Nadr, the mawla of Umar ibn Ubaydullah that he had heard that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said over the martyrs of Uhud, "I testify for them." Abu Bakr as-Siddiq said, "Messenger of Allah! Are we not their brothers? We entered Islam as they entered Islam and we did jihad as they did jihad." The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said, "Yes, but I do not know what you will do after me." Abu Bakr wept profusely and said, "Are we really going to out-live you!"[282]

وَحَدَّثَنِي عَنْ مَالِكٍ، عَنْ أَبِي النَّضْرِ، مَوْلَى عُمَرَ بْنِ عُبَيْدِ اللَّهِ أَنَّهُ بَلَغَهُ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ لِشُهَدَاءِ أُحُدٍ هَؤُلاَءِ أَشْهَدُ عَلَيْهِمْ . فَقَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ الصِّدِّيقُ أَلَسْنَا يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ بِإِخْوَانِهِمْ أَسْلَمْنَا كَمَا أَسْلَمُوا وَجَاهَدْنَا كَمَا جَاهَدُوا . فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم بَلَى وَلَكِنْ لاَ أَدْرِي مَا تُحْدِثُونَ بَعْدِي . فَبَكَى أَبُو بَكْرٍ ثُمَّ بَكَى ثُمَّ قَالَ أَئِنَّا لَكَائِنُونَ بَعْدَكَ

---

[281] Al-Matalib al-'Aliyah bi Zawaid al-Masanid al-Thamaniyyah (Riyadh: Dar al-Asimah; 1st edition, 1420H) [annotator: Abd Allah b. Zafir b. Abd Allah al-Shahri], vol. 16, p. 64, #3919

[282] Malik ibn Anas, al-Muwatta (Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi, Beirut), vol. 1, p. 461 – 462; kitab al-Jihad, chapter 21, hadith 32; https://www.sunnah.com/urn/410140

CONCLUSION

We have intellectually established the fact that the noble Prophet was not buried in the room of Bibi Aisha, rather he was laid to ground in his personal room. Also, the Shi'a creed did not view Abu Bakr, Umar and Aisha as unbelievers (kuffar) like Pharaoh. However, their "Kufr (disbelief)" is in the rejection of the Wilayah of Ali ibn Abi Talib.

And as per the fact that the two Caliphs were buried beside the noble Prophet, that is neither a will (wasiyah) by the Prophet nor a merit for the two Caliphs. It was rather historical happening that was "enforced" by the government of the time.

Lastly, what the Caliphs, Aisha and others did after the demise of the Prophet is not a licence for anybody to rebuke, abuse or curse them publicly as some fanatics (amongst the Shi'a) do. And in the desperation of the Ahlu Sunnah too, whenever truths are laid bare to them in an academic sitting, their response has always been, "are you saying they will enter hell-fire?" Some will even quickly quote one of their hadith, "Prophet says: Abu Bakr and Umar will be in Paradise." The fact is that such discussion is not about Paradise or hell. Allah alone is the Judge of that, and perhaps they repented[283] before they died. Indeed, all human's fates and judgements are eventually in the hands of Allah only.

---

[283] As it is documented that Lady Aisha regretted before she died, and even instructed that her remains should not be buried beside the Prophet. She was buried in al-Baqi beside other wives of the Prophet.

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

ALI AND THE CIVIL WARS

Question 31:

The Shi'ites believe that the first three successors of the Noble Prophet were unbelievers. Why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, pledge his allegiance to them? Why did he fight religious wars against them during their reign? Some of your scholars answer these questions by citing the need to prevent a violent outbreak (fitna), but why did he engage in the Battle of the Camel, where he fought against Aisha, Talha, and Zubair, Radiyallahu Anhu? And why did he fight in the Battle of Siffin against Muawiya and his Muslim followers from Syria (Sham)? These two battles led to the massacre of over 70,000 Muslims from both sides.

The Sunni doctrine does not see any fault in these battles because they were a destined violent outbreak (fitna), which, once it occurs, leaves no chance to escape. As a result of this outbreak, the companions had differing opinions: some were with Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, because he was the legitimate Muslim leader; others sided with Muawiya due to his argument for bringing those responsible for the murder of Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, to justice. The last category consisted of those who remained neutral, trying to reconcile the two parties. This third category represented the majority opinion among the Prophet's companions, and many joined this view, including Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu. However, the Shi'ites do not consider this opinion valid; they believe that everything that occurred was simply Allah's destiny.

We await your response to the above questions and an explanation of why he did not fight against those before him.

THE REPLY

First the claim that Shi'i creed is that the first two Caliphs were Kuffar (unbelievrs) has been treated in the previous chapter. Therefore, there is no need going back to it.

Second, why did Ali ibn Abi Talib pay allegiance to Abu Bakr and 'Umar had it been they were unbelievers? This point has also been treated in chapter 9, 11 and especially 12. However, in summary there are three historical reports about it:

- Ali paid allegiance to Abu Bakr after 6 months when he realized people's attitude had changed towards him. His allegiance was to protect his social status while maintaining his true believe about them.
- Ali was coerced to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr
- Ali did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr at all

None of the three options showed Ali's true approval of Abu Bakr's Khilafah.

Third, Ali never participated in any war fought by either Abu Bakr or Umar. What is on records was that Ali helped the Caliphs on many occasions in decision making or corrected their ill judgments.

Fourth, despite the fact that Ali's right was usurped, he never took up sword to wrestle the Caliphs. This fact has been fully discussed in the aforementioned chapters. As per the reason why Ali, during his reign, later took up the sword and fought off the rebel groups, the hadith of the Prophet answer that precisely.

Imam al-Bazzar records this Sahih hadith of 'Ali:

Narrated 'Alī:

The Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, made a covenant to me to fight the oath-breakers, the Qāsitīn and the apostates.[284]

حدثنا عباد بن يعقوب قال نا الربيع بن سعيد قال نا سعيد بن عبيد عن علي بن ربيعة عن علي قال عهد إليّ رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم في قتال الناكثين والقاسطين والمارقين

Shaykh al-Albani records the full hadith and state Ali's motive:

Narrated'Abu-Sa'id:

We were sitting, waiting for the Mesenger of Allah, peace be upon him. Then he came to us from the room of one of his wives. So, we stood with him. But his shoe broke, and he appointed 'Ali to stay behind to repair it. Then, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, walked and we walked with him. He (the Prophet) stood up, waiting for him (i.e. Ali) and we stood with him. Then he said: "There is among you one who will fight over the tāwīl (right interpretation) of this Qur'ān, just as I fought over its tanzīl (revelation)." Each of us wished it was him, and among us were Abū Bakr and 'Umar. But he (the Prophet) said: "No. He is only the repairer of the shoe" referring to 'Alī, may Allāh be pleased with him." We went to him (i.e. 'Alī) to give him the good news. But he responded as though he had earlier heard it.[285]

Comment: Sahīh on the conditions of Muslim

Imām Ibn 'Abd al-Barr says pertaining to this hadith:

---

[284] Abū Bakr Ahmad b. 'Amr b. 'Abd al-Khāliq al-Bazzār, Musnad al-Bazzār (Beirut: Muasassat 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān; 1st edition, 1409 H) [annotator: Dr. Mahfūz al-Rahmān Zayn Allāh], vol. 3, pp. 26-27, #774

[285] Muhammad Nāsir al-Dīn al-Albānī, al-Silsilah al-Ahādīth al-Sahīhah (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif), vol. 5, p. 639, # 2487

ولهذه الأخبار طرق صحاح قد ذكرناها فى موضعها وروى من حديث على ومن حديث ابن مسعود ومن حديث أبى أيوب الأنصارى أنه أمر بقتال الناكثين والقاسطين والمارقين

For these reports are sahīh chains, which we have mentioned at their places. It is narrated in the hadīth of 'Alī, and the hadīth of Ibn Mas'ūd, and the hadīth of Abū Ayūb al-Ansārī that he ('Alī) was commanded (by the Prophet) to fight the oath-breakers, and the Qāsitīn and the apostates.[286]

In short, Ali fought upon the truth unlike his opponents who fought upon falsehood. Those who fought Ali were no doubt rebels.

Hafiz ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani explains the hadith of Ali:

قَوْلُهُ }ثَبَتَ أَنَّ أَهْلَ الْجَمَلِ وَصِفِّينَ وَالنَّهْرَوَانِ بُغَاةٌ{ هو كما قال وَيَدُلُّ عليه حَدِيثُ عَلِيٍّ أُمِرْت بِقِتَالِ النَّاكِثِينَ وَالْقَاسِطِينَ وَالْمَارِقِينَ رَوَاهُ النَّسَائِيُّ في الْخَصَائِصِ وَالْبَزَّارُ وَالطَّبَرَانِيُّ وَالنَّاكِثِينَ أَهْلُ الْجَمَلِ لِأَنَّهُمْ نَكَثُوا بَيْعَتَهُ وَالْقَاسِطِينَ أَهْلُ الشَّامِ لِأَنَّهُمْ جَارُوا عن الْحَقِّ في عَدَمِ مُبَايَعَتِهِ وَالْمَارِقِينَ أَهْلُ النَّهْرَوَانِ لِثُبُوتِ الْخَبَرِ الصَّحِيحِ فِيهِمْ أَنَّهُمْ يَمْرُقُونَ من الدِّينِ كما يَمْرُقُ السَّهْمُ من الرَّمِيَّةِ وَثَبَتَ في أَهْلِ الشَّامِ حَدِيثُ عَمَّارٍ تَقْتُلُهُ الْفِئَةُ الْبَاغِيَةُ

His statement {It is firmly established that the people of al-Jamal (under 'Āishah), and Siffīn (under Mu'āwiyah) and al-Nahrawān (i.e. the Khawārij) were rebels} is true. What further proves this is the hadīth of 'Alī in which he says "I

---

[286] Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr, al-Isti'āb fī Ma'rifah al-Sahābah (Beirut: Dār al-Jayl; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Alī b. Muhammad al-Bajāwī], vol. 3, p. 1117

was COMMANDED to fight the oath-breakers, the Qāsitīn and the apostates."

Al-Nisāī recorded it in al-Khasāis, as well as al-Bazzār and al-Tabarānī. The people of al-Jamal (under 'Āishah) were the oath-breakers because they broke their bay'ah to him (i.e. 'Alī), and the Qāsitīn were the people of Syria (under Mu'āwiyah) because they left the haqq (truth) in their refusal to give him bay'ah. The apostates were the people of al-Nahrawān (i.e. the Khawārij) due to the establishment of the sahīh report about them that "they apostasized from the religion as the arrow leaves the bow (i.e. completely)". The hadīth that 'Ammār would be killed by a rebellious group is also established about the Syrians (i.e. they murdered him).[287]

Interestingly, despite the clarity of the Prophet's saying [which none of those who participated against Ali could deny hearing it directly from the Prophet or Ali himself via letters he wrote to reason with these rebels and his warning to them on the battlefield itself], some Sunni Ulama continue to excuse these rebels saying they only made ijtihad though they were wrong but will be rewarded for their ijtihad. A weird thought indeed!

Lastly, the professor claims:

The last category is those who hanged on the fence without taking side but busy trying to reconcile the two parties. This third category was the opinion of the majority of the Prophet's companions which many joined and later many shared the same view, even Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu.

For a fact, majority of the sahabah in all the three wars were on the side of Ali ibn Abi Talib. Only very few went the other side. However, what is the position of Islam on those who chose to stay on the fence which the Professor

---

[287] Abū al-Fadl Ahmad b. 'Alī b. Hajar al-'Asqalānī al-Shāfi'ī, *Talkhīs al-Habīr fī Ahādīth Rāafi'ī al-Kabīr* (Madīnah al-Munawwara; 1384 H) [annotator: Sayyid 'Abd Allāh Hāshim al-Yamānī al-Madanī], vol. 4, p. 44.

claimed were the majority and even lied that Ali later shared their view?

- How can Ali ever share their passive and non-challant view when the Prophet instructed him to fight those three rebellious groups which he did?
- How can Ali ever share their view when Allah's instruction is:

وَإِن طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا فَإِن بَغَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا عَلَى الْأُخْرَى فَقَاتِلُوا الَّتِي تَبْغِي حَتَّى تَفِيءَ إِلَى أَمْرِ اللَّهِ فَإِن فَاءتْ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا بِالْعَدْلِ وَأَقْسِطُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

"And if two parties of the believers fight, make peace between them; but if one of them acts wrongfully towards the other, fight that which acts wrongfully until it returns to Allah's command; then if he returns, make peace between them with justice and act equitably; surely Allah loves those who act equitably."[288]

Allah did not instruct anybody to sit back and watch. There is no record [unless the professor can fabricate one] that the so-called majority who passively stood on the fence tried to caution the rebels to stop their fitnah; and yet, they sat back while Allah instructed them to "...fight that which acts wrongfully until it returns to Allah's command..."

The result of the fitnah that these three rebels created linger till date. May Allah forgive and have mercy upon the Ummah, and restore her past glory and power.

---

[288] Surah al-Hujurah: 9

CHAPTER THIRTY

WORLDLY RICHES

Question 32:

The Shi'ites believe that the leaders before Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, were tyrants who forced themselves into power for worldly benefits; they denied the revealed leader as the Prophet pronounced due to selfish interests. What did they accumulate during their reign? Who among them was wealthy? When Umar died, there was a debt that his entire family and tribe could not settle, which was only resolved after some of the Quraysh extended their helping hands. Abu Bakr and Uthman were initially known as wealthy and pious; their riches were used for the upliftment of Islam during their lifetimes.

Who among them nominated his son as a successor? If there truly were selfish interests, it should have been extended to their siblings. You, the Shi'ites, claim that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, bequeathed leadership to his son Al-Hassan. Why didn't Abu Bakr bequeath it to his son Abdurrahman? Why didn't Umar bequeath it to his son Abdullah? Why didn't Uthman bequeath it to his son Aban?

THE REPLY

First, according to Umar ibn al-Khattab himself, Imam Ali Ibn Abi Talib and Al-Abbas used to view and consider both Abu Bakr and Umar as tyrants (ظالم) and evil doers (فاجر) as documented by the Sunni Imam, Ibn Hibban in his book Sahih.[289] Besides, what do we call Umar under the command of Abu Bakr who attacked and threatened to burn the house of Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet; all because of seeking allegiance for Abu Bakr as Ali and his

---

[289] Ibn Hibban, *Sahih* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah; 2nd edition, 1414H) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arna'ut], vol. 14, pg. 577, Hadith 6608

supporters refused to recognized his leadership ?[290] What do we call the duo who confiscated the Prophet's personal properties from reaching Fatima, her only surviving daughter ?[291] What do we call Abu Bakr who labeled the Sahabi and Prophet's Zakat collector, Malik ibn Nuwayrah as apostate and got him and his people massacred by Khalid ibn Waleed?[292]

Second, it is true that the Shi'a hold the belief that the Caliphs before Imam Ali hijacked and usurped the seat of the Khilafah and denied Ali his right. Is this belief exclusive to the Shi'a? No. Imam Abu Haamid al-Ghazali, one of the greatest Ahlu Sunnah scholars writes:

لكن أسفرت الحجة وجهها وأجمع الجماهير على متن الحديث من خطبته في يوم غدير خم باتفاق الجميع وهو يقول : من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه . فقال عمر : بخ بخ يا ابا الحسن لقد أصبحت مولاي ومولى كل مولى ، فهذا تسليم ورضىً وتحكيم ، ثم بعد هذا غلب الهوى لحب الرياسة ، وحمل عمود الخلافة ، وعقود النبوة ، وخفقان الهوى في قعقعة الرايات ، واشتباك ازدحام الخيول ، وفتح الامصار ، وسقاهم كأس الهوى ، فعادوا إلى الخلاف الأول : فنبذوه وراء ظهورهم ، واشتروا به ثمنا قليلا. ولما مات رسول الله (ص) قال قبل وفاته : ائتوا بدواة وبيضاء لأزيل لكم إشكال الأمر ، وأذكر لكم من المستحق بعدي. قال عمر رضي الله عنه : دعوا الرجل فإنه ليهجر ، وقيل : يهدر

---

[290] Ibn Abi Shaybah, *al-Musannaf* (Maktabah al-Rashid) [annotator: Hamd ibn Abd Allah al-Jumua' and Muhammad ibn Ibrahim], vol. 13, pg. 468, hadith 38042; Abu Ja'far Muhammad Ibn Jarir al-Tabari, *Tarikh* (Dar al-Ma'arif) [annotator: Muhammad Abu al-Fadhl Ibrahim], vol. 3, pg. 202.

[291] See details on *Chapter Fourty: Caliph Abu Bakr, Hazrat Fatima and Fadak*

[292] See *Chapter Thirty Seven (37), under "Meaning of Apostasy"*

"The people and scholars agree upon the context of the narration of the sermon on the day of Ghadir Khum in which the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, [Whoever I am the Mawla then Ali is his Mawla]. Then Umar Ibn Khattab said: Congratulations! Oh Abal Hasan, you have become my Mawla and the Mawla of every'believer. This shows his (Umar) submission and acceptance and confirmation (of Ali's Mawla-ship). However, after that, he (i.e Umar) was defeated by his desire and love of power in flag of leadership, and he was dominated by desire, and the desire to hold the flag of Caliphate, and the joy to open and conquer states, and by that they (i.e Umar and others) reverted to the early phase, they dispensed with the agreement (of Ghadir Khum) and sold it at a low price. And also the Prophet (peace be upon him) in his last illness before his death said: "Bring me a tablet and ink-pot, so that I may write for you a document by following which you will never go astray" whereupon Umar said: "Don't bring it, the man is talking nonsense."[293]

Has this "thought" made al-Ghazali a Raafidh, a kaafir? There are few other Ahlu Sunnah foremost scholars with this view. Were they also kuffar? Besides, Umar himself once confessed to covet power.[294]

Third, the Professor tried to defend the Caliph Umar in particular when he says:

"When Umar died, there was debt of which the whole of his family and tribe men cannot settle, but was only settled after some of the Quraish extend there helping hands."

While there is nowhere the Shi'a accused Umar of wealth accumulation and in fact, on the contrary, Umar ibn al-Khattab seemed very strict in the wealth management and distribution of the Muslim Ummah during his reign unlike

---

[293] Majmu'a Rasaa'il al-Imam al-Ghazali (Maktabah al-Tawkifiyah, Cairo-Egypt) [annotator: Ibrahim Amin Muhammad], pg. 483

[294] See the hadith of Imam Abd al-Razzaq in his al-Musannaf in Chapter *Twenty Seven (27).*

Uthman. However, the claim of our Professor [that Umar left huge debt that...] is nothing but a fallacy. On the contrary, the Caliph left fortune.

Imam Ibn Shabah (d. 262 H) records:

حدثنا موسى بن إسماعيل قال حدثنا سلام بن أبي مطيع عن أيوب قال قلت لنافع هل كان على عمر رضي الله عنه دين فقال ومن أين يدع عمر دينا وقد باع رجل من ورثته ميراثه بمائة ألف .

Musa b. Isma'il – Salam b. Abi Muṭi' – Ayub:

I said to Nafi', "Did 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, have any debt?" So, he replied, "From where can 'Umar claim to have any debt when a man from his inheritors sold his inheritance for 100,000 (dinars)?"[295]

Al-Hafiz comments on this report:

فروى عمر بن شبة في كتاب المدينة بإسناد صحيح ان نافعا قال من أين يكون على عمر دين وقد باع رجل من ورثته ميراثه بمائة الف انتهى وهذا لا ينفي ان يكون عند موته عليه دين فقد يكون الشخص كثير المال ولا يستلزم نفي الدين عنه فلعل نافعا أنكر ان يكون دينه لم يقض

'Umar b. Shabah recorded in Kitab al-Madinah with a sahih chain that Nafi' said, "From where can 'Umar claim to have any debt when a man from his inheritors sold his inheritance for 100,000 (dinars)?". This does not negate the possibility that when he died, he had a debt. The person can be very rich person. But that does not necessarily mean

---

[295] Abu Zayd 'Umar b. Shabah al-Numayri al-Basri, Tarikh al-Madinah al-Munawwarah (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1417 H) [annotators: 'Ali Muhammad Dandal and Yasin Sa'd al-Din Bayan], vol. 2, p. 88, # 1603

that he does not have any debt. Perhaps, Nafi' was denying the existence of any unpaid debt for him."[296]

No matter how hard Al-Hafiz try to convince us, bottomline is that each inheritor of Umar got 100, 000 dinars and no doubt in accordance to Islamic tradition, debts must have been paid. Umar ibn al-Khattab left 13 children[297] , 9 of which were male and other 4 were females. One of the males, Abd al-Rahman b. Umar had died before his father. Meaning eight sons and 4 females inherited Umar. Therefore:

Each male child got 100, 000 dinars

8 male children X 100, 000 dinars = 800, 000 dinars

Each female child got 50, 000 dinars [half of male]

4 female children X 50, 000 dinars = 200, 000 dinars

Sum total is 1, 000, 000 dinars.

If we are to estimate this in modern currency, dinar of that time was a gold coin with a worth [of 1 gold dinar equivalent] of 193 U.S dollars. This will be $193, 000, 000 [One hundred and ninety-three million U. S dolars. This was the value of what Umar's children inherited from him. How he accumulated this stupendous fortune knowing him to be an average businessman is of no concern to us. We only establish this fact to expose the lie and fabrication of the Professor.

Lastly, the Professor tried to prove the sincerity of the two three Caliphs by not bequeathing the seat of authority to their respective son by they died. However, the Professor

---

[296] Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Ṣahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Ṭaba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, p. 53

[297] Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh Ṣahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-Ṭaba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 7, p. 53

questioned the Shi'a why [according to them] Ali bequeathed the Khilafah to his son al-Hasan? This is no doubt a fair question and we have answered in the previous chapters that the Messenger of God had seeded the khilafah unto his progeny when he says, "I left over you two khalifah ... the book of Allah and my offspring, my ahl al-Bayt."

Furthermore, Allah reveals to us the case of Prophet Ibrahim:

وَإِذِ ابْتَلَى إِبْرَاهِيمَ رَبُّهُ بِكَلِمَاتٍ فَأَتَمَّهُنَّ قَالَ إِنِّي جَاعِلُكَ لِلنَّاسِ إِمَامًا قَالَ وَمِن ذُرِّيَّتِي قَالَ لاَ يَنَالُ عَهْدِي الظَّالِمِينَ

"And when his Lord tried Ibrahim with certain words, he fulfilled them. He said: Surely, I will make you an Imam of mankind. Ibrahim said: And of my offspring? My covenant does not include the unjust, said He."[298]

That was one of the many blessings our Lord bestowed Prophet Ibrahim with. All his offsprings till Qiyamat except the unjust among them were made Imams.

Our Prophet and his direct lineage via Fatimah are of true Ibrahimic offspring. Even Ali ibn Abi Talib would have been excluded from this since he was not of Muhammad's offspring but his case was exceptional. Prophet himself declared him as his successor. Therefore, the Khilafah is Aali Muhammad [Muhammad's offspring]'s divine property, not Abu Bakr's or Umar's or anybody else's property to be bequeath to his son.

---

[298] Surah al-Baqarah: 124

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

IMAGINARY QUESTIONS FROM THE KHAWARIJ

Question 33:

What interests did the rest of the companions have in disobeying the will of the Noble Prophet? What did Abu Bakr give them (the companions) or promise them that led them to follow him against the commands of Allah and Muhammad, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam? Initially, they left everything and everyone for the sake of Allah; this action is mentioned in the Qur'an 5:100, among others.

How can you respond to a member of the Khawarij creed and doctrine if he accuses Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, of causing a massive bloodshed of innocent Muslims, while the other three leaders before him established the roots of Islam, conquered non-Islamic countries and kingdoms, and Islamized them? During Uthman's reign, when he faced his death, coup plotters came to Madinah, and he denied any counterattack against them in order to discourage bloodshed among Muslims. They attacked his house and massacred him. In contrast, during Ali's reign, Radiyallahu Anhu traveled as far as Kufah and Basra to fight those who did not fight him but only presented a request beforehand. This was intended to secure their allegiance and pledge, and this reason led to the battle. What then shall be your response?

Furthermore, if he (the Khawarij) poses the following question again, how will you respond to him? The three leaders were aided by Allah during their reigns; they fought the greatest dynasties on earth at that time and were victorious. They successfully passed the message of Islam to various nations. While Allah did not aid Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, during his reign because he never fought an enemy nor extended Islamic land even by a meter, they claim that he was not on the right path while Ali was not; that's why his assassins were from his own

disciples who rebelled against him in the end. What shall be your response?

The actual fact is that Sunnis are the only ones who can defend Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, from all these accusations. We Sunnis believe in the leadership of the three successors and that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, was part of all their victories. What occurred during his reign was only what Allah had destined and not his will or wish as a leader. Almost all the accusations that Shi'ites level against the leaders before Ali are the same accusations that the Khawarij point at Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, in the eyes of a reasonable man. All the honor and dignity that Shi'ites attribute to Ali is more doubtful than if such elevation were applied to the leaders before him.

THE REPLY

Since the fundamental belief of the Shi'a is that Ali ibn Abi Taalib was the appointed Khalifah (successor) of the Prophet, and that the Ummah betrayed him by giving bay'ah to Abu Bakr, then our professor has no choice but to ask:

What & which interest did the rest of the companions have for disobeying the will of the Noble Prophet? What did Abubakar gave them (companions) or promised them that led them follow him against Allah and Muhammad Sallahu Alaihi Wassaam commands? Initially, they left everything and every one because of Allah, this action was mentioned in the Qur'an 5:100 among others.

First, we have in the previous chapters[299] proved the Khilafah (immediate successorship) of Ali ibn Abi Talib and then quoted the hadith of what the Prophet foretold. Again, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852H) documents:

Al-Fadl, Abu Naim - Fitr b. Khalifah - Habib b. Abi Thabit - Thalabah b. Yazid:

---

[299] Chapter 5 and 6

I heard Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, saying: "I swear by Allah, verily, the Umm [unlettered] Prophet, peace be upon him, told me: "They (the Ummah) will soon betray you after me." [Earlier cited in chapter 6]

In fact, earlier before that, Allah warned the Sahabah after the battle of Uhud:

"And Muhammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles have already passed away before him; if then he dies or killed will you turn back upon your heels? And whoever turns back upon his heels, he will by no means do harm to Allah in the least and Allah will reward the grateful."[300]

The truth is that some of the sahabah turned back upon their heels after the demise of the Prophet. Imam Muslim records a concurrent [mutawattir] hadith:

Anas b. Malik reported Allah's Apostle (peace be upon him) as saying:

Some men from amongst my sahabah would turn to my Cistern; when I would see them and they would be presented to me, they would be detained in the way while coming to me. I would say: My Lord, they are my Sahabah, they are my Sahabah, and it would be said to me: You don't know what innovations they made after you[301]

وَحَدَّثَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ حَاتِمٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَفَّانُ بْنُ مُسْلِمٍ الصَّفَّارُ، حَدَّثَنَا وُهَيْبٌ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَبْدَ الْعَزِيزِ بْنَ صُهَيْبٍ، يُحَدِّثُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَنَسُ بْنُ مَالِكٍ، أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ لَيَرِدَنَّ عَلَيَّ الْحَوْضَ رِجَالٌ مِمَّنْ

---

[300] Surah Aal-Imran, verse 144

[301] Sahih Muslim 2304 a; In-book reference : Book 43, Hadith 56; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 30, Hadith 5706 https://sunnah.com/muslim/43/56

صَاحَبَنِي حَتَّى إِذَا رَأَيْتُهُمْ وَرُفِعُوا إِلَيَّ اخْتُلِجُوا دُونِي فَلأَقُولَنَّ أَيْ رَبِّ أُصَيْحَابِي أُصَيْحَابِي فَلَيُقَالَنَّ لِي إِنَّكَ لاَ تَدْرِي مَا أَحْدَثُوا بَعْدَكَ .

As rightly pointed out by the Professor that "...Initially, they left everything and every one because of Allah..." but in the end, some of them swayed and turned back upon their heels (in the language of the Qur'an). A case of a Sahabi was revealed by al-Bukhari. He records:

Narrated'Al-Musaiyab:

I met Al-Bara bin `Azib and said (to him). "May you live prosperously! You enjoyed the company of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and gave him the Pledge of allegiance (of Al-Hudaibiya) under the Tree." On that, Al- Bara said, "O my nephew! You do not know what we have done after him (i.e. his death)."[302]

حَدَّثَنِي أَحْمَدُ بْنُ إِشْكَابٍ، حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ فُضَيْلٍ، عَنِ الْعَلاَءِ بْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، قَالَ لَقِيتُ الْبَرَاءَ بْنَ عَازِبٍ ـ رضى الله عنهما ـ فَقُلْتُ طُوبَى لَكَ صَحِبْتَ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَبَايَعْتَهُ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ. فَقَالَ يَا ابْنَ أَخِي إِنَّكَ لاَ تَدْرِي مَا أَحْدَثْنَا بَعْدَه.

For a fact, al-Bara ibn Azib was one of the Sahabah who paid allegiance to the Prophet under the tree as Allah refers to that scene when He says:

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا

"Certainly! Allah was well pleased with the believers when they swore allegiance to you (O Prophet) under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity on them and rewarded them with a near victory."[303]

---

[302] Sahih al-Bukhari 4170In-book reference : Book 64, Hadith 212; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 488 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/64/212

[303] Surah al-Fath, verse 18; Ahlu Sunnah suggest that this "pleasure" remains with those sahabah who gave bay'a forever. Unfortunately, the "condition" and "time limit" in the verse restricted the "pleasure" to that scene only. The continuity of such pleasure, however, depends on firmness and steadfastness upon that bay'a, and not deviation.

This was exactly what al-Musaiyab read and believed that those who could go this far with the Prophet were certainly prosperous. However, the reply of al-Bara "O my nephew! You do not know what we have done after him (i.e. his death)" confirmed:

- The Qur'an predictions: "...if then he dies or killed will you turn back upon your heels? And whoever turns back upon his heels, he will by no means do harm to Allah in the least..."
- The hadith of the Prophet: ".... I would say: My Lord, they are my Sahabah, they are my Sahabah, and it would be said to me: You don't know what innovations they made after you"

That was the reality of some sahabah. What made them sway and turn upon their heels? Allah reveals after the battle of Uhud:

And certainly, Allah made good to you His promise when you slew them by His permission, until when you became weak-hearted and disputed about the affair and disobeyed after He had shown you that which you loved; of you were some who desired this world and of you were some who desired the hereafter; then He turned you away from them that He might try you; and He has certainly pardoned you, and Allah is Gracious to the believers."[304]

Allah pardoned them after most of them turned upon their heels and abandoned the Prophet in the battle of Uhud. Were they going to be pardoned for their innovations, disobedience and betrayals after the demise of the Prophet? This is unknown to anyone and not even to the Prophet.[305]

---

[304] Surah Aal-Imran, verse 152

[305] Imam Bukhari documents: Narrated Ibn 'Abbās, may Allāh be pleased with them both:

Allāh's Apostle said, "You will be gathered before Allāh bare-footed, naked and not circumcised." Then (quoting the Qur'ān) he said:-- "As We began the first creation, We shall repeat it. A promise We have undertaken: Truly we shall do it." (21:104) The Prophet then said, "The

first of the human beings to be dressed on the Day of Resurrection, will be Ibrāhīm. Lo! Some men from my Sahābah will be brought and then (the angels) will drive them to the left side (Hell-Fire). I will say. 'O my Lord! My Sahābah!' My Sahābah!' Then a reply will come, 'You do not know what they did after you. These people have continued to be apostates since you left them.' I will say as the pious slave (the Prophet 'Īsā) said: 'And I was a witness over them while I dwelt amongst them. When You took me up. You were the Watcher over them and You are a Witness to all things. **If You punish them, they are Your slaves, and if You forgive them, You, only You, are the All-Mighty, the All-Wise.**' (5:117) [**Source**: Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī al-Ju'fī, *Sahīh* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafā Dīb al-Baghā], vol. 3, p. 1222, # 3171]

Imām al-'Asqalānī states under this *hadīth*:

قال الفربري ذكر عن أبي عبد الله البخاري عن قبيصة قال هم الذين ارتدوا على عهد أبي بكر فقاتلهم أبو بكر يعني حتى قتلوا وماتوا على الكفر

Al-Farbarī said: It is mentioned from Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī from Qubaysah who said: "They are those who apostasized during the time of Abū Bakr, and he fought them" meaning until they were killed, and they died upon *kufr*. [**Source**: Abū al-Fadl Ahmad b. 'Alī b. Hajar al-'Asqalānī al-Shāfi'ī, *Fath al-Bārī Sharh Sahīh al-Bukhārī* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah; 1379 H), vol. 11, p. 385]
Anyway, that was the opinion of Qubaysah and as Ahlu Sunnah, he tried to give us an impression that only those sahabah whom Abu Bakr fought apostacised. Some Ahlu Sunnah scholars even tried to hoodwink us that those people were not Sahabah rather those who became Muslims after the demise of the Prophet. But the word "my sahabah" destroyed this fallacy not to mention the fact that another hadith defined those apostates.

Anas Ibn Malik narrates: "The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, "Some men **from amongst those who kept me company (**ليردن على الحوض رجال ممن صاحبني**)** will meet me at the lake-Fount (in Qiyamat). **I will see them, and they will be presented to me.** Then, they will be forced away from me. I will say: O my Lord, **my Sahabah! My Sahabah**! It will be said to me: '**You do not know what they innovated after you.**" [Sahih Muslim Hadith 2304; book 43, Hadith 56; English ref. Book 30, Hadith 5706].

In short, the motive of those who renegade after the Prophet was nothing but the love of al-duniya (the world) as Allah states it beautifully.

Now, the Professor decided to use the juggernaut with his imaginary khawarij questions. He says:

How will you reply a member of Khawarij creed and doctrine if he accuses Aliyu's Radiyallahu Anhu reign for a massive blood shed of innocent Muslims, while the other three leaders before him establish the root of Islam, conquer Unislamic countries and kingdoms and Islamatize them? During the reign of Uthman and the occasion of his death, coup plotters came to Madinah and he denied any counter attack against them with the reason for discouraging blood shed of Muslims, they attacked his house and massacre him. While during the reign of Ali Radiyallahu Anhu he traveled as far as Kufah and Basra to fight those that didn't fight him but only presented a request prior, this will make them give their allegiance & pledge, and this reason was what led to the battle. What then shall be your response?

He continues:

Furthermore, if he (Khawarij) poses the following again how will you respond to him; the three leaders were aid'ed

---

On one hand, the "crime" of those who Abu Bakr fought was their refusal to pay him the zakat. How is abandoning Zakat makes one apostate who deserves death? Few sahabah abandoned Zakat at the lifetime of the Prophet and he never declared them apostates or killed them.[see: Sahih al-Bukhari 1468; Book 24, Hadith 71; English reference: vol. 2, Book 24, Hadith 547 **and** also Sahih al-Bukhari 1460; Book 24, Hadith 63; English reference: vol. 2, Book 24, Hadith 539].

Was al-Bara Ibn Azib who confessed [**"O my nephew! You do not know what WE have done after him (i.e. his death)"**] also talking about abandonment of Zakat? Obviously, the Ahlu Sunnah are only trying their best to save part of their beliefs that **ALL** the sahabah were righteous and of the people of paradise. Indeed, this is nothing but a day dream belief.

by Allah during their reigns, they fought the greatest dynasties on earth by that period and they were victorious. They passed the message of Islam to various nations successfully. While Allah didn't aid Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu during his reign, because he never fights an enemy, nor did he extend the Islamic land with a meter they were on the right path while Ali isn't, that's why his assassinators were from his discifles who rebelled against him lastly. What shall be your response?

The actual fact is that Sunni's are the only ones that can defend Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu from all these accusations.

The truth is that the above imaginary khawarij questions were the arguments of the Salafiyyah progenitor Sheikh Ibn Taymiyyah in series of his reckless replies to his Shi'i contemporary scholar al-Allamah al-Hili [Ibn al-Mutahhar]. Those thoughts were so reckless that even the Sunni scholars of Ibn Taymiyyah's time declared him munafiq. For example, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani states about Ibn Taymiyyah:

ومنهم من ينسبه إلى النفاق لقوله في عليّ ما تقدم ولقوله أنه كان مخذولاً حيثما توجه ، وأنه حاول الخلافة مراراً فلم ينلها وإنما قاتل للرياسة لا للديانة ، ولقوله أنه كان يحب الرياسة وانّ عثمان كان يحب المال ، ولقوله أبو بكر أسلم شيخاً يدري ما يقول وعليّ أسلم صبياً والصبي لا يصح إسلامه على قول

Among them (i.e. the Sunni 'ulama) were those who accused him (i.e. Ibn Taymiyyah) of hypocrisy (nifaq) due to his statement about 'Ali that we have mentioned, and on account of his statement that he (i.e 'Ali) was humiliated wherever he turned, and that he (i.e. 'Ali) repeatedly sought the Khilafah but did not get it, and that he (i.e. 'Ali) fought only for power, and not for religion,

and due to his (Ibn Taymiyyah's) statement that he (i.e. 'Ali) loved power while 'Uthman loved money, and on account of his (Ibn Taymiyyah's) statement that Abu Bakr accepted Islam as an adult who knew what he was saying while 'Alī accepted Islām as a child, and the Islam of a child, upon his statement, is invalid![306]

Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah also implicitly declared 'Ali to be an unbeliever, and an evil-doer:

الرابع أن الله قد اخبر انه سيجعل للذين آمنوا وعملوا الصالحات ودا وهذا وعد منه صادق ومعلوم أن الله قد جعل للصحابة مودة في قلب كل مسلم لا سيما الخلفاء رضي الله عنهم لَا سِيَّمَا أَبُو بَكْرٍ وَعُمَرُ؛ فَإِنَّ عَامَّةَ الصَّحَابَةِ وَالتَّابِعِينَ كَانُوا يَوَدُّونَهُمَا، وَكَانُوا خَيْرَ الْقُرُونِ. وَلَمْ يَكُنْ كَذَلِكَ عَلِيٌّ، فَإِنَّ كَثِيرًا مِنَ الصَّحَابَةِ وَالتَّابِعِينَ كَانُوا يُبْغِضُونَهُ وَيَسُبُّونَهُ وَيُقَاتِلُونَهُ.

The fourth issue is that Allah had informed him (the Prophet) that He would create love for those who believe and do righteous deeds. This promise from Him was true, and it is well-known that Allah has created love for the Sahabah in the heart of every Muslim, especially the Khalifahs, may Allah be pleased with them, especially Abu Bakr and 'Umar. This is because the generality of the Sahabah and Tabi'in loved both of them (i.e. Abu Bakr and 'Umar), and these were the best of generations. This was not the case for 'Ali. This is because the MAJORITY of the Sahabah and Tabi'in HATED, CURSED and FOUGHT him.[307]

---

[306] Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī, *al-Durar al-Kāminah* (Beirut: Dār al-Jayl; 1414), vol. 1, p. 144 http://islamport.com/w/trj/Web/279/49.htm

[307] Minhaj al-Sunnah [Muasassat Qurtubah, 1st Edition](annotator: Muhammad Rashid Salim), vol. 7, page 99 – 100; http://islamport.com/w/tym/Web/3420/2231.htm

The suitable answer to these questions has been earlier[308] discussed. However, we give a general summary with, yet again, the statement of Hafiz ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani as he explains the hadith of Ali:

"His statement {It is firmly established that the people of al-Jamal (under 'Āishah), and Siffīn (under Mu'āwiyah) and al-Nahrawān (i.e. the Khawārij) were rebels} is true. What further proves this is the hadīth of 'Alī in which he says:

"I was COMMANDED [by the Prophet] to fight the oath-breakers, the Qāsitīn and the apostates". Al-Nisāī recorded it in al-Khasāis, as well as al-Bazzār and al-Tabarānī. The people of al-Jamal (under 'Āishah) were the oath-breakers because they broke their bay'ah to him (i.e. 'Alī), and the Qāsitīn were the people of Syria (under Mu'āwiyah) because they left the haqq (truth) in their refusal to give him bay'ah. The apostates were the people of al-Nahrawān (i.e. the Khawārij) due to the establishment of the sahīh report about them that "they apostasized from the religion as the arrow leaves the bow (i.e. completely)". The hadīth that 'Ammār would be killed by a rebellious group is also established about the Syrians (i.e. they murdered him)."

And what is the basis of this Prophetic command? Again, we read:

"... he (the Prophet) said: "There is among you one who will fight over the tāwīl (right interpretation) of this Qur'ān, just as I fought over its tanzīl (revelation)." Each of us wished it was him, and among us were Abū Bakr and 'Umar. But he (the Prophet) said: "No. He is only the repairer of the shoe" referring to 'Alī, may Allāh be pleased with him." We went to him (i.e. 'Alī) to give him the good news. But he responded as though he had earlier heard it"

---

[308] Kindly see chapter 31

These recurrent Prophetic traditions destroy all the imaginary questions of the khawarij as presented by the Professor.

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

PROPHET'S LAST WILL

(WASIYYAH) [1]

Question 34:

Shi'ites accuse Umar of denying the Noble Prophet's writing regarding what he said would be the path to faith, claiming that the Ummah would not go astray if they adhered to it after his death. You assert that it was his will for leadership, but Umar denied bringing any paper.

In the narrations from your books, you claim that Umar even said that the Prophet was demented, but our authentic books contain no such additional narration. What was narrated in Bukhari and other Sunni books is: "The depression resulting from the illness of the Noble Prophet is significant; do not increase his depression/illness. The Book of Allah (Qur'an) is sufficient."

According to you, this was the instruction of the Prophet that he destroyed, and for that reason, he is considered an unbeliever. He is held responsible for the evil deeds of the Ummah because he led them astray, leaving the Prophet to die in sadness, displeasure, and sorrow for not delivering the last message.

Where was Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, at that time? Why didn't he follow the Prophet's instruction? Was the instruction directed solely to Umar? Is Umar stronger than Ali? Or is he more influential? Why didn't Ali fight him or oppose his opinion against the Prophet's opinion to ensure that the mission of the Prophet was fulfilled?

In the reported narration in "Musnad" of Ahmad, it was Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, who replied and said: "I can memorize it; say whatever you wish." The Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, replied: "I urge you to be firm in prayers; Zakah should be given as commanded and explained. I also urge you to be kind to your slaves."

If the paper was not brought, who actually denied its presentation? Was it the one who said he could memorize it or the one who said that depression was significant and suggested giving him time to rest?

THE REPLY

First set of accusations

The Professor writes:

Shi'ites accuse Umar of denying the Noble Prophet's writing regarding what he said would be the path to faith, claiming that the Ummah would not go astray if they adhered to it after his death. You assert that it was his will for leadership, but Umar denied bringing any paper.

In the narrations from your books, you claim that Umar even said that the Prophet was demented, but our authentic books contain no such additional narration. What was narrated in Bukhari and other Sunni books is: "The depression resulting from the illness of the Noble Prophet is significant; do not increase his depression/illness. The Book of Allah (Qur'an) is sufficient."

What is the significance of the information the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) wanted to tell the Ummah? What did the Prophet intend to write? Who prevented the Prophet from writing this document, and why did the Prophet not insist on writing it? Who really accused the Prophet of delirium from amongst the sahabah? How grave was the conduct of the sahabah in front of their dying Prophet? By shedding light on these, all the myths and banters of our professor will be eliminated.

First, the significance of the Prophet's information is highlighted in the hadith of Ibn Abbas. Imam Muslim documents:

Ishaq b. Ibrahim – Waki' – Malik b. Maghwal – Talhah b. Musarrif – Sa'id b. Jubayr – Ibn 'Abbas:

"Thursday! What a Thursday it was!" Then, tears began to flow until I saw them on his cheeks as if they were the strings of pearls. "The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said, 'Bring me a shoulder-blade and an inkpot or a tablet and an inkpot, so that I may write for you a document after which you will never go astray'. They said: 'The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, is raving mad.'"[309]

حدثنا إسحاق بن إبراهيم أخبرنا وكيع عن مالك بن مغول عن طلحة بن مصرف عن سعيد بن جبير عن ابن عباس أنه قال يوم الخميس وما يوم الخميس ثم جعل تسيل دموعه حتى رأيت على خديه كأنها نظام اللؤلؤ قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ائتوني بالكتف والدواة أو اللوح والدواة أكتب لكم كتابا لن تضلوا بعده أبدا فقالوا إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يهجر

So, the document is something that will prevent the Ummah from EVER going astray. It seems up till this stage that our dear professor agreed with us. However, he threw the first banter. He says:

"... you claim that it was his will for leadership but Umar denied bringing any paper."

Yes, the Shi'a's understanding and interpretation of the document the Sahabah denied the Prophet from writing was that Prophet intended to put in black and white the Khilafah after him in favour of Ali Ibn Abi Talib. Interestingly, this was also the interpretation of some

---

[309] Abu al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjaj al-Qushayri al-Naysaburi, Sahih Muslim (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-'Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Fuad 'Abd al-Baqi], vol. 3, p. 1257, # 1637 (21)
***NOTE:** Read the end-footnote of this chapter for the meaning of يهجر – raving mad"

Sunni scholars[310] who claimed the writing would have been in favour of Abu Bakr.

However, having a claim is easier than proving it. What is the supportive evidence to establish this august Sunni claim? Abu Bakr's virtues and appointment to lead the salat were the Sunni supportive evidence. The two issues[311] which have been discussed previously did not have any context relating to the statement of the Prophet, "Bring me a shoulder-blade and an inkpot or a tablet and an inkpot, so that I may write for you a document after which you will never go astray."

On the other side of the aisle, Shi'a claim have a supporting context. Few months before the demise of the Prophet, he delivered the farewell sermon at Arafah and Ghadir Khumm. Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani documents:

وَقَالَ إِسْحَاقُ : أنا أَبُو عَامِرٍ الْعَقَدِيُّ ، عَنْ كَثِيرِ بْنِ زَيْدٍ ، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عُمَرَ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ ، عَنْ عَلِيٍّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ ، قَالَ :

Isḥāq said: Abū 'Āmir al-'Aqadī – Kathīr b. Zayd – Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'Alī – his father - 'Alī:

إِنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَضَرَ الشَّجَرَةَ بِخُمٍّ ، ثُمَّ خَرَجَ آخِذًا بِيَدِ عَلِيٍّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ : أَلَسْتُمْ تَشْهَدُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى رَبُّكُمْ ؟ قَالُوا : بَلَى ، قَالَ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وسَلَّمَ : أَلَسْتُمْ تَشْهَدُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ أَوْلَى بِكُمْ مِنْ أَنْفُسِكُمْ ، وَأَنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ أَوْلِيَاؤُكُمْ ؟ فَقَالُوا : بَلَى . قَالَ : فَمَنْ كَانَ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ مَوْلَاهُ ، فَإِنَّ هَذَا مَوْلَاهُ ، وَقَدْ تَرَكْتُ

---

[310] Sunni scholars like the student of Ibn Saad, Al-Baladhuri in his Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 1, p. 542; Ibn Hazm, Jawami, p. 264; al-Diyarbarki, Tarikh al-Khamis, vol. 2, p. 182; al-Halabi, al-Sirah al-Halabiyyah, vol. 3, p. 456. Even Ibn Hisham in his al-Sira [vol. 4, p. 212 – 213] also express similar thought only that he connects it with the purported leadership of Abu Bakr in Salat

[311] See chapter 29 and chapter 10 respectively for exposition

فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ أَخَذْتُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَضِلُّوا : كِتَابُ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى ، سَبَبُهُ بِيَدِهِ ، وَسَبَبُهُ بِأَيْدِيكُمْ ، وَأَهْلُ بَيْتِي ، هَذَا إِسْنَادٌ صَحِيحٌ ، وَحَدِيثُ غَدِيرِ خُمٍّ قَدْ أَخْرَجَهُ النَّسَائِيُّ مِنْ رِوَايَةِ أَبِي الطُّفَيْلِ ، عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ أَرْقَمَ ، وَعَلِيٍّ ، وَجَمَاعَةٍ مِنَ الصَّحَابَةِ ، وَفِي هَذَا زِيَادَةٌ لَيْسَتْ هُنَاكَ ، وَأَصْلُ الْحَدِيثِ أَخْرَجَهُ التِّرْمِذِيُّ أَيْضًا

Verily, the Prophet, peace be upon him, came to a tree at (Ghadīr) Khumm. Then he came out, holding the hand of 'Alī, and saying: "Do you not testify that Allāh is your Lord?" They said, "Yes, we do." He said, "Do you not testify that Allāh and His Messenger are more entitled to you than yourselves and that Allāh and His Messenger are your Awliyā?" They said, "Yes, we do". He said, "So, whosoever Allāh and His Messenger are his Mawlā, verily this one (i.e. 'Alī) is his mawlā. I have left behind over you that which if you hold fast to it you will never go astray: the Book of Allāh – one end of which is in His Hand and the other in your hands – and my Ahl al-Bayt.[312]

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani comments: This chain is sahih.

Likewise, Imam al-Tirmidhi documents:

Narrated Abū Sa'id AND Zayd b. Arqam:

Allāh's Apostle said: "I will leave among you what if you adhere to it you will never go astray after me. One of them BOTH is greater than the other: the Book of Allāh, a rope stretching from the heavens to the earth, AND my 'itrah, my Ahl al-Bayt. Both shall never separate until they meet

---

[312] al-Maṭ ālib al-Āliyah bi Zawāid al-Masānīd al-Thamāniyyah (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah; 1414 H) [annotator: Prof. Shaykh Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī], vol., 4, p. 65, # 3972
https://library.islamweb.net/hadith/display_hbook.php?bk_no=325&pid=154669&hid=4075

me at the Lake-Font. Watch carefully how you treat them both after me.[313]

حدثنا علي بن المنذر الكوفي ، حدثنا محمد بن فضيل حدثنا الأعمش عن عطية عن أبي سعيد ، والأعمش

عن حبيب بن أبي ثابت عن زيد بن أرقم قالا : قال رسول الله : إني تارك فيكم ما إن تمسكتم به لن تضلوا

بعدي ، أحدهما أعظم من الآخر : كتاب الله حبل ممدود من السماء إلى الأرض وعترتي أهل بيتي ، ولن

يفترقا حتى يردا علي الحوض ، فانظروا كيف تخلفوني فيهما) صحيح (

Imam al-Tirmidhi also document similar hjadith from Jabir ibn Abdullah al-Ansari who narrated his own version at Arafah.[314]

Summary

- At Arafah of his last Hajj, the Prophet verbally declared:

"O Mankind! Indeed, I have left amongst over you, that which if you hold fast to it, you will never go astray: the book of Allah and my itrah (progeny), my ahl al-Bayt."

- At Ghadir Khumm, on his way from the last Hajj to Madinah, he (peace be upon him and his progeny) equally declares verbally having held the

---

[313] Muhammad Nāsir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Sahīh Sunan al-Tirmidhī* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif; 1420 H), vol. 3, p. 543, # 3788

[314] Hafiz Abu Eisa Muhammad ibn Eisa at-Tirmidhi, *Jami' at-Tirmidhi* – Arabic-English version (Riyadh: Darussalam) [annotator: Hafiz Abu Tahir Zubair Ali Za'i], vol. 6, p. 435, hadith 3786

hand of Ali and made him the Mawla[315] of all the believers:

"I will leave among you what if you adhere to it you will never go astray after me. One of them BOTH is greater than the other: the Book of Allāh ... AND my 'itrah, my Ahl al-Bayt..."

- Then, on his death-bed, the Prophet says: "Bring me a shoulder-blade and an inkpot or a tablet and an inkpot, so that I may write for you a document after which you will never go astray."

What else did the Prophet intend to write in the context of "you will never go astray" other than what he had said verbally [previously]? That is, he wanted to write that he left the Qur'an and his progeny, the Ahl al-Bayt over the believer of which whoever hold on to them both will never go astray vis-à-vis the appointment of Ali as the Khalifah.

This was what Umar ibn al-Khattab sensed and he changed the tide. Imam Bukhari documents:

Ibrahim b. Musa – Hisham – Ma'mar – al-Zuhri – 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Abd Allah – Ibn 'Abbas:

When the time of the death of the Prophet, peace be upon him, approached, and there were some men in the room, and among them was 'Umar b. al-Khattab. He (the Prophet) said, "Come near. Let me write for you a document after which you will never go astray." 'Umar said, "Verily, the illness has now fully possessed the Prophet, peace be upon him. And you have the Qur'an. So, the Book of Allah is sufficient for us." The people in the room disputed. Among them were those who said, "Come near so that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, may write for you a document after which you will never go astray." And among them were those who were repeating what 'Umar said. When their noise and dispute

[315] See chapter one for the meaning of Mawla

became very rowdy in the presence of the Prophet, peace be upon him, he said, "Stand up and leave me."

Narrated 'Ubayd Allah: Ibn 'Abbas used to say: "It was a great disaster that their dispute and noise prevented the Messsenger of Allah, peace be upon him, from writing that document for them."[316]

حدثنا إبراهيم بن موسى أخبرنا هشام عن معمر عن الزهري عن عبيد الله بن عبد الله عن ابن عباس قال :لما حضر النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال وفي البيت رجال فيهم عمر بن الخطاب قال هلم أكتب لكم كتابا لن تضلوا بعده .قال عمر إن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم غلبه الوجع وعندكم القرآن .فحسبنا كتاب الله .واختلف أهل البيت اختصموا فمنهم من يقول قربوا يكتب لكم رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كتابا لن تضلوا بعده ومنهم من يقول ما قال عمر فلما أكثروا اللغط والاختلاف عند النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال قوموا عني قال عبيد الله فكان ابن عباس يقول إن الرزية كل الرزية ما حال بين رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم وبين أن يكتب لهم ذلك الكتاب من اختلافهم ولغطهم

Umar ibn al-Khattab, in other words, says, "Qur'an is enough for us, we do not need the itrah, the ahl al-Bayt." Several Sunni scholars tried to defend Umar ibn al-Khattab's action by saying, "he was only concern about the health of the Prophet and did not want to stress him to write." And these Umar's advocates conclude that had the

---

316 Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju'fi, al-Jami' al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 6, p. 2680, # 6932

Prophet really meant to write the document, and had the document really important, even after the dispute amongst the sahabah and their eviction from Prophet's vicinity, he (peace be upon him and his progeny) would still have called for the ink and paper to write the will.

These are lame excuses. For a fact, these Sunni scholars [except for a few] are pleased to defend Umar's action and water down the importance of the Prophetic order. They do not even move to the fact that Prophet was accused of raving madness. Anyway, an eye-witness who understands the gravity of what happened concludes:

"Ibn 'Abbas used to say: "It was a great disaster that their dispute and noise prevented the Messsenger of Allah, peace be upon him, from writing that document for them."

And should the Prophet later write the document, would they ever unite and respect it? If they could stoop so low accusing the Prophet of madness or being overcomed by illness [meaning he was not in his right sense] and disputing in front of him, then would they ever welcome the document after his demise?

Our professor suggests a thuggery approach:

Where was Ali Radiyallahu Anhu at that time? Why didn't he follow the Prophet's instruction? Or was the instruction directed to Umar alone? Is Umar stronger than Aliyu? Or is he more influential? Why didn't he fight him or fight his opinion against the Prophet's opinion and make sure that the mission of the prophet was fulfilled?

What a thought! In a bid to exonerate Umar's action and downplay the Prophet's instruction, our dear professor suggested that Ali ibn Abi Talib should have fought or struggled with Umar had it been Umar was wrong or the document was truly important. Ali ibn Abi Talib had never been a rogue and fighting in an already chaotic situation in front of the Prophet will further worsen the case. Allah warned the believers:

۞ يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تُقَدِّمُوا بَيْنَ يَدَيِ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَرْفَعُوا أَصْوَاتَكُمْ فَوْقَ صَوْتِ النَّبِيِّ وَلَا تَجْهَرُوا لَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ كَجَهْرِ بَعْضِكُمْ لِبَعْضٍ أَنْ تَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالُكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ لَا تَشْعُرُونَ. إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَغُضُّونَ أَصْوَاتَهُمْ عِنْدَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُولَٰئِكَ الَّذِينَ امْتَحَنَ اللَّهُ قُلُوبَهُمْ لِلتَّقْوَىٰ ۚ لَهُمْ مَغْفِرَةٌ وَأَجْرٌ عَظِيمٌ.

"O you who believe! Be not forward in the presence of Allah and His Apostle, and be careful of (your duty to) Allah; surely Allah is Hearing, Knowing. O you who believe! Do not raise your voices above the voice of the Prophet, and do not speak loud to him as you speak loud to one another, lest your deeds became null while you do not perceive." Surely those who lower their voices before Allah's Apostle are they whose hearts Allah have proved for guarding (against evil); they shall have forgiveness and a great reward."[317]

Which of the sahabah who were present with the Prophet that day observed the instructions of these noble verses? Imam al-Bukhari further documents:

Qubaysah – Ibn 'Uyaynah – Sulayman al-Ahwal – Sa'id b. Jubayr – Ibn 'Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both:

"Thursday! And what a Thursday it was!" Then, he (Ibn 'Abbas) wept till the stones on the ground were soaked with his tears. Then, he said, "The illness of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, became severe on Thursday, and he said, 'Bring me a sheet of paper so that I may write a document for you after which you will never go astray'. They differed, and it is not proper to differ in front of a prophet. So, they said, 'The Messenger of Allah is raving

[317] Surah al-Hujurah, verse 1 -3

mad.' He replied, 'Leave me, as I am in a better state than what you are calling me towards.' Then, he ordered them, when he was about to die, to do three things: 'Expel the idolaters from the Arabian Peninsula and show respect to all foreign delegates by giving them gifts as I used to do.' And I forgot the third."[318]

حدثنا قبيصة حدثنا ابن عيينة عن سليمان الأحول عن سعيد ابن جبير عن ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما أنه قال يوم الخميس وما يوم الخميس ثم بكى حتى خضب دمعه الحصباء فقال :اشتد برسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم وجعه يوم الخميس فقال ائتوني بكتاب أكتب لكم كتابا لن تضلوا بعده أبدا . فتنازعوا ولا ينبغي عند نبي تنازع فقالوا هجر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال دعوني فالذي أنا فيه خير مما تدعونني إليه . وأوصى عند موته بثلاث :أخرجوا المشركين من جزيرة العرب وأجيزوا الوفد بنحو ما كنت أجيزهم .ونسيت الثالثة

Yet, the professor suggested that Ali should have fought and worsen the situation in the presence of the noble Prophet. The Ali ibn Abi Talib we know is the Ali of the Qur'an and Sunnah of the Prophet. He is the Ali nursed and trained by the Prophet.

Lastly, the professor makes another attempt when he says:

The reported narration in "Musnad" of Ahmad, it was Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu that replied and said; I can memorize it, say whatever you wish. The Prophet

Sallahu Alaihi Wassalam replied; I urge you to be firm in prayers, Zakah should be given out as commanded and explained, I also urge you to be kind to your slaves. If the

---

[318] Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Ibrahim b. Mughirah al-Bukhari al-Ju'fi, al-Jami' al-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathir; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafa Dib al-Bagha], vol. 3, p. 1111, # 2888

paper was not brought, who actually denied the paper to be presented? Is it the one who said he can memorize or the one who said that depression is much let us give him time to rest?

It is imperative at this junction to quote the hadith as it is stated in Musnad. Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents:

Bakr ibn Eisa al-Rasibiy – Umar ibn al-Fadl – Nu'aym ibn Yazid:

عن علي بن أبي طالب قال: أمرني النبي صلى الله عليه والسلام أن آتيه بطبق يكتب فيه ما لا تضل أمته من بعده. قال: فخشيت أن تفوتني نفسه. قال: قلت: إني أحفظ وأعي. قال: (أوصي بالصلاة والزكاة وما ملكت أيمانكم).

Narrated Ali Ibn Abi Talib who said: the Prophet, peace be upon him, ordered me to bring a plate so he can write in it what [if adhere to] the Ummah will not go astray after him. He (Ali) said: "Then, I was afraid he will breathe his last." He (Ali) said: "I will memorize and conscious of it." He (the Prophet) said: "Observe salat, and zakat and (take care of) those whom your right hands possessed."[319]

Sheikh Shu'aib ibn al-Ar'naut comments:

إسنده ضعيف. نعيم بن يزيد لم يرو عنه غير عمر بن الفضل وقال أبو حاتم: مجهول.

The chain of transmitter is WEAK. Nu'aym ibn Yazid, no one narrate from him except Umar ibn al-Fadl. And Abu Hatim said: [He is] Majhul (Unknown).

---

[319] Ahmad ibn Hanbal, *Musnad* (Mu'asasat al-Risalah) [annotator: Shu'aib al-Ar'naut], vol. 2 p. 105, hadith no. 693

Apart from the fact that the hadith is of no probative value, following expositions are obvious from it:

- Only Ali was allegedly with the Prophet as against the previous ahadith in which many of the sahabah were present.
- The previous ahadith indicate the day of the incident to be "Thursday" while the hadith ascribed to Ali took place on the day the Prophet breathe his last[320] , that was on Monday.

---

[320] The same hadith with more information [which indicate the Prophet died while giving the alleged instructions] is documented in: **kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kubra [al-Nashr Maktab, Cairo)[annotator: Dr. Ali Muhammad Umar], vol. 2, p. 214.**

MEANING OF "RAVING MAD"

Imām al-Shāmī (d. 942 H), for instance, states:

الهجر: بالضم: الهذيان وقول الباطل ويطلق على الكلام الفاحش.

"Al-Hujr. is **raving madness and irrational talk**, and it is (also) used to refer to obscene, immoral talk."

Source: Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥī al-Shāmī, *Subul al-Hudā al-Rashād fi Sīrah Khayr al-'Ibād* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1414 H) [annotators: 'Ādil Aḥmad 'Abd alMawjūd and 'Alī Muḥammad Ma'ūd], vol. 11, p. 105

Imām Ibn Salām (d. 224), an ancient, leading Sunnī *ḥadīth* expert, has this submission too:

وأما الهجر فى الكلام فإنه الهذيان

As for *al-hujr* in statements, **it is raving madness**." [**Source:** Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Salām al-Harwī, *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* (Haydarabad: Majlis Dāirah alMa'ārif al-'Uthmāniyyah; 1st edition, 1384 H), vol. 2, p. 64]

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (d. 852 H):

والهجر بالضم ثم السكون الهذيان

- The instructions in the hadith ascribed to Ali were, "observe salat, and zakat and (take care of) those whom your right hands possessed." On the contrary, the aforementioned ahadith about the incident of Thursday highlights the Prophet's general instructions [after being denied to write the vital document] thus: "Then, he [the Prophet] ordered them, when he was about to die, to do three things: 'Expel the idolaters from the Arabian Peninsula and show respect to all foreign delegates by giving them gifts as I used to do.' And I forgot the third."

Those are series of contradictions in the two ahadith. Hence, the last attempt of the Professor to lay blame on Ali ibn Abi Talib in lieu of Umar and other sahabah is a failed attempt

---

"Al-Hujr is **raving madness."** **[Source:** Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Beirut: Dār alMa'rifah li al-Ṭabā'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 8, p. 101]

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

PROPHET'S LAST WILL

(WASIYYAH) [2]

Question 35:

The above happened on Friday morning. Why didn't he request the paper during the entire day? After that, he had Saturday, Sunday, and Monday noon before he died, yet he never mentioned it again. Shouldn't he have requested it again?

Question 36:

This sorrow that you say the Prophet died from—was it part of the religion or not? If your answer is "it is part of the religion," are you insinuating that the Prophet died and the religion was not complete because he didn't make the pronouncement? If it is not part of the religion, what then is the need for all this?

Question 37:

Must this message be in writing? Why shouldn't it be pronounced publicly to serve as a reference?

Question 38:

Who on earth informs you of the content of someone's intention that was not mentioned? You claim it was the name of a successor that constituted the will. Do you have knowledge of the unseen? Or are your leaders, who are blessed with such knowledge (the unseen), your source?

QUICK REPLY

Whoever has read the previous chapter [34th] carefully will realise all the above highlighted questions have been answered. Obviously, there is nothing new.

To question 35:

- The incident happened on Thursday and not Friday as mistaken by the Professor. Prophet died on Monday. We have equally suggested the reason why it was not necessary for the Prophet to insist on writing the document. It doesn't make any sense to write and force such document on those who have divided and "fighting" on its writing whilst shouting "Qur'an is enough," meaning, "we do not need any other thing."

This is exactly the submission of Ibn Abbas when he says: "It was a great disaster that their dispute and noise prevented the Messsenger of Allah, peace be upon him, from writing that document for them."

Allah says to His Messenger: "Nothing is (obligatory) upon the Messenger but to deliver (the message) ..." [al-Maidah: 99], "You are not a watcher over them" [al-Ghashiyah: 22], "Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or reject" [al-Insan: 3]. Therefore, why would the Prophet insist and force document on them?

To question 36:

- It is unimaginable that a believer would ask, "Is what the Prophet intend to write a part of religion?" after a clear instruction of the Prophet, "Bring me a sheet of paper so that I may write a document for you after which you will never go astray." If it is not part of religion, then what could it be part of?
- Of course, the illustrious Prophet had repetitively made the verbal pronouncements of this message at Arafah and Ghadir Khumm. On his sick-bed, he intended to put it in black and white, and by given an explicit and unambiguous order, it was to be followed without "if" or "but."

To question 37:

- Another terrible question. The noble Prophet said, "Bring me a sheet of paper so that I may write a document for you after which you will never go astray" yet what the Professor could ask is, "Must this message be in writing? Why shouldn't it be pronounced for the public that will serve as a reference?"
- Allah says:

"It behoves not a believing man and a believing woman that they should have any choice in their matter when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter; and whosoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he surely strays off a manifest straying." [al-Ahzab: 36]

- For a fact, we have proven that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) had unequivocally pronounced his message at various places. Writing and documentation was what was left.

To question 38:

- The context of the command of the Prophet clearly informed us his intention. This question has equally been dealt with in the previous chapter.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

COMPARING BLACK AND WHITE

Question 39:

Since Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, is considered an apostate because he disobeyed the Prophet's instruction, what shall be the status of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, when he was instructed to erase the Prophet's title of Prophethood and replace it with his real name and surname during the Treaty of Hudaibiyyah, which he did not do? What was Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu's action in this regard?

Under Sunni doctrine, both were right. Umar was kind to the Prophet and discouraged any stress or depression against him, and the Noble Prophet affirmed this by not requesting it again. On the other hand, Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, demonstrated his high regard and respect for Prophethood, and the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, respected his opinion and cleaned the name himself. If Umar is considered an apostate for not producing paper for the Prophet and disobeying him, then Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, was also disobedient for not cleaning what he was told to clean.

THE REPLY

It is very interesting how the Professor was trying to tell the world that color black and white is the same. In a bid to protect and defend Umar's action at the death-bed of the Prophet, the case of al-Hudaybiyyah which involves Ali ibn Abi Talib is introduced and our professor tried to juxtapose the two; then, he concluded 'the two cases are the same since "approved" by the Prophet.'

First, who exactly is the Professor trying to convince with his polemic conclusion? Professor was trying to convince his opponent by citing his own Sunni book and ideology. How is that sensible? For a fact, the Shi'ah do not have the exact version of that Sunni report pertaining to the so-called "Ali's disobedience" at Hudaybiyyah; therefore, how is it obligatory on them to accept the Sunni reports, interpretation and ideological thought?

Second, it is expedient to examine the two Sunni reports and see the Prophet's reaction to the two incidents. Only then can we draw our conclusion.

ALI, THE PROPHET AND THE TREATY OF AL-HUDAYBIYYAH

Imam Bukhari documents: Narrated Al-Bara:

When the Prophet (peace be upon him) intended to perform `Umra in the month of Dhul-Qada, the people of Mecca did not let him enter Mecca till he settled the matter with them by promising to stay in it for three days only. When the document of treaty was written, the following was mentioned: These are the terms on which Muhammad, Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) agreed (to make peace). They said, "We will not agree to this, for if we believed that you are Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) we would not prevent you, but you are Muhammad bin `Abdullah." The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "I am Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and also Muhammad bin `Abdullah." Then he said to `Ali, "Rub off (the words) Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him)", but `Ali said, "No, by Allah, I will never rub off your name." So, Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) took the document and wrote, 'This is what

Muhammad bin `Abdullah has agreed upon: No arms will be brought into Mecca except in their cases, and nobody from the people of Mecca will be allowed to go with him (i.e. the Prophet (peace be upon him) even if he wished to follow him and he (the Prophet (peace be upon him) will not prevent any of his companions from staying in Mecca if the latter wants to stay...[321]

حَدَّثَنَا عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُوسَى، عَنْ إِسْرَائِيلَ، عَنْ أَبِي إِسْحَاقَ، عَنِ الْبَرَاءِ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ قَالَ اعْتَمَرَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فِي ذِي الْقَعْدَةِ، فَأَبَى أَهْلُ مَكَّةَ أَنْ يَدَعُوهُ يَدْخُلُ مَكَّةَ، حَتَّى قَاضَاهُمْ عَلَى أَنْ يُقِيمَ بِهَا ثَلاَثَةَ أَيَّامٍ، فَلَمَّا كَتَبُوا الْكِتَابَ كَتَبُوا هَذَا مَا قَاضَى عَلَيْهِ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم. فَقَالُوا لاَ نُقِرُّ بِهَا، فَلَوْ نَعْلَمُ أَنَّكَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ مَا مَنَعْنَاكَ، لَكِنْ أَنْتَ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ. قَالَ أَنَا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَأَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ . ثُمَّ قَالَ لِعَلِيٍّ امْحُ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ . قَالَ لاَ، وَاللَّهِ لاَ أَمْحُوكَ أَبَدًا، فَأَخَذَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم الْكِتَابَ، فَكَتَبَ هَذَا مَا قَاضَى عَلَيْهِ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، لاَ يَدْخُلُ مَكَّةَ سِلاَحٌ إِلاَّ فِي الْقِرَابِ، وَأَنْ لاَ يَخْرُجَ مِنْ أَهْلِهَا بِأَحَدٍ، إِنْ أَرَادَ أَنْ يَتَّبِعَهُ، وَأَنْ لاَ يَمْنَعَ أَحَدًا مِنْ أَصْحَابِهِ أَرَادَ أَنْ يُقِيمَ بِهَا

DEDUCTIONS

- The Prophet of mercy (peace be upon him and his progeny) was trying to sign a peace treaty with the unbelievers
- His blessed name and title were written by Ali ibn Abi Talib as "Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah."

---

[321] Sahih al-Bukhari 2699; In-book reference: Book 53, Hadith 9; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 3, Book 49, Hadith 863 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/53/9

- The unbelievers rejected the title "the Messenger of Allah"
- Out of his mercy and peace-loving attitude, the noble Prophet asked Ali to rub off the epithet "Messenger of Allah."
- Ali responded saying "I will never rub you (that is, "the Messenger of Allah") off."
- The noble Prophet rubs the epithet himself and writes "Muhammad ibn Abdillah" instead.

What does this [Ali's action] signifies – disobedience or firm belief in the epithet? Even the Professor could not help himself but to affirm the truth saying:

"... Ali Radiyallahu Anhu on the other hand showed how high & respectful he has for Prophethood, and the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi Wasallam respected his opinion and cleans the name himself."

Interestingly, at this particular treaty of al-Hudaybiyyah, Umar ibn al-Khattab confessed how he doubted the "Prophet-hood" of Muhammad, peace be upon him and his progeny.

Imam Ibn Hibban [d. 456 H] records 'Umar's own testimony of what happened on the Day of Hudaybiyyah in his Sahih:

'Umar said, "I swear by Allah, I never DOUBTED since I accepted Islam UNTIL THAT DAY (i.e. Day of Hudaybiyyah). I went to the Prophet, peace be upon him and said, "Are you NOT the Messenger of Allah IN TRUTH?"[322]

---

[322] Ibn Hibbān, Sahīh (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risālah;2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt], vol. 11, p. 216, # 4872

When Umar confronted the Prophet and ask such terrible question "Are you NOT the Messenger of Allah in truth?" among many other questions, the messenger of Allah responded saying, "Yes [I am a Messenger of Allah in truth]." The scholars of Ahlu Sunnah tried to defend his action saying he was only concerned and could not take how the unbelievers are taking advantage of the Muslims with their

فقال عمر بن الخطاب رضوان الله عليه: والله ما شككت منذ أسلمت إلا يومئذ فأتيت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقلت: ألست رسول الله حقا ؟

Shuaib al-Ar'naut: Authentic hadith

حديث صحيح

Ali understood the Prophet's "order" was forced by the circumstance and the demand of the unbelievers. Hence, such "order" was never a real and obligatory order.

Had Ali ibn Abi Talib rub the epithet of Muhammad off, the unbelievers and the Munafiqeen will definitely spread their rumor that Ali had denied Muhammad's Messengership; and people like the Professor will today question Ali's quick action by labelling it "weak faith."

---

demands. This seems reasonable until Umar left the Prophet, went and ask Abu Bakr the same terrible question: "Is he NOT the messenger of Allah in truth?" Abu Bakr said, "Yes, he is." Only, then did Umar keep silent. What happened to the reply of the Messenger of Allah that only the reply of Abu Bakr could "calm" him down? That was nothing but **doubt** and he himself confessed this saying, **"I never DOUBTED since I accepted Islam UNTIL THAT DAY."**

Doubting the Messengership of Muhammad after one has belief is a sign of weak Iman:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ثُمَّ لَمْ يَرْتَابُوا وَجَاهَدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنفُسِهِمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ

"Only those are the believers who have believed in Allāh and His Messenger, **and afterward doubt not** but strive hard with their wealth and their lives for the Cause of Allāh. Those! They are the truthful ones" [49:15]

UMAR, THE SAHABAH, THE PROPHET AND THURSDAY'S INCIDENT[323]

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Ibrahim b. Musa – Hisham – Ma'mar – al-Zuhri – 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Abd Allah – Ibn 'Abbas:

When the time of the death of the Prophet, peace be upon him, approached, and there were some men in the room, and among them was 'Umar b. al-Khattab. He (the Prophet) said, "Come near. Let me write for you a document after which you will never go astray." 'Umar said, "Verily, the illness has now fully possessed the Prophet, peace be upon him. And you have the Qur'an. So, the Book of Allah is sufficient for us."

The people in the room disputed. Among them were those who said, "Come near so that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, may write for you a document after which you will never go astray." And among them were those who were repeating what 'Umar said. When their noise and dispute became very rowdy in the presence of the Prophet, peace be upon him, he said, "Stand up and leave me."

Imam al-Bukhari further documents:

Qubaysah – Ibn 'Uyaynah – Sulayman al-Ahwal – Sa'id b. Jubayr – Ibn 'Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both:

"Thursday! And what a Thursday it was!" Then, he (Ibn 'Abbas) wept till the stones on the ground were soaked with his tears. Then, he said, "The illness of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, became severe on Thursday, and he said, 'Bring me a sheet of paper so that I may write a document for you after which you will never go astray'. They differed, and it is not proper to differ in front of a prophet. So, they said, 'The Messenger of Allah is raving mad.' He (the Prophet) replied, 'Leave me, as I am in a better state than what you are calling me towards.'

---

[323] See chapter 32 and 33 for details.

DEDUCTIONS

- On his sick-bed, the noble Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, gave an explicit and unambigious order, "Bring me a sheet of paper so that I may write a document for you after which you will never go astray"
- Umar ibn al-Khattab, on one hand says, "Verily, the illness has now fully possessed the Prophet, peace be upon him. And you have the Qur'an. So, the Book of Allah is sufficient for us." In the same vein, the Prophet was accused of raving madness – talking nonsense.
- This Umar's action [whatever excuse given] led to chaos, rowdiness and dispute of those present in front of the Prophet, an act of Haram which Allah says could destroy one's righteous deeds (al-Hujurat: 1 – 3).

The noble Prophet's response to Umar's and co together with their uncontrollable disputations was, 'Leave me, as I am in a better state than what you are calling me towards.' Meaning, "I am not mad or fully possessed by illness; what I ordered you is the truth and I am better off compare to your negative accusations and shambolic attitude."

Are these only our own rationalities and deductions? While some Sunni scholars are economical with the truth, other Sunni scholars were not afraid to state the truth. For example, Sheikh al-Islam Imam Abu Hamid al-Ghazali writes:

ولما مات رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال قبل وفاته : (ائتوا ...
بداوة لأزيل لكم إشكال الأمر وأذكر من المستحق لها بعدى) فقال
عمر دعوا الرجل فإنه ليهجر .

... And also, the Prophet (peace be upon him) in his last illness before his death said: "Bring me a tablet and ink-pot, so that I may write for you a document by following which

you will never go astray" whereupon Umar said: "Don't bring it, the man is talking nonsense."[324]

Likewise, Ibn al-Athir writes:

ومنه حديث مرض النبي (ص): {قالوا: ما شأنه؟ أهجر؟} أي: اختلف كلامه بسبب المرض على سبيل الإستفهام. أي: هل تغير كلامه واختلط لأجل ما به من المرض؟ وهذا أحسن ما يقال فيه و لا يجعل إخبارا فيكون إما من الفحش أو الهذيان. والقائل كان عمر ولا يظن به ذلك.

In the narration of the illness of Allah's Prophet (peace be upon him): {They said: What is wrong with him? Is he delirious?} Meaning: There is question of disputation over his statement as a result of (his) illness. That is: Has his words changed and mingled with what is from his illness? This is the best [way to interpret] what is said and it should not be said as a declarative sentence; because it means either talking nonsense or delirious. And the speaker [person who said this] was Umar and this is not an accusation against him.[325]

Therefore, if these are the true pictures of the two events, then we are pressed to ask how exactly the two narrations and behaviours of the two actors the same?

---

[324] Majmu'a Rasaa'il al-Imam al-Ghazali (Maktabah al-Tawkifiyah, Cairo-Egypt) [annotator: Ibrahim Amin Muhammad], page 483

[325] Majd ad-Din Ibn Athir, *al-Nihayah fi Gharib al-Ahadith wa al-Athar* [Dar al-Jawziyyah, Saudi Arabia, 1st Edition – single volume], section **Har'f Haa [bab Haa ma'a al-Jim]**, p. 1000

CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE

ALI, UTHMAN AND THEIR RELATIVE GOVERNORS

Question 40:

The doctrine of the Shi'ites accuses Uthman of giving his relatives special regard and priority in terms of appointments and special assignments, which earned him the nickname "lover of relatives." Our question is: why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, also appoint his relatives during his reign? During the reign of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, he appointed Abdullah bin Abbas bin Abdul-Mutalib as the Governor of Basra (Abu Talib and Abbas are germane brothers). His Governor of Yemen was Ubaidullah bin Abbas, a brother to the Governor of Basra. In Makkah, he appointed Qutham bin Abbas, a brother to the above governors. In Madinah, he appointed Ma'abad bin Abbas, a brother to the above three governors. What a surprise! Four governors from the same family? They are all first cousins to the president!

Furthermore, they are not the only relatives of his who were part of his administration. His governor in Khurasan was his nephew, Ja'adatu bin Hubairah; his mother is the daughter of Abu Talib. The governor he appointed in Egypt was Muhammad bin Abu Bakr Siddiq. Don't think he is not related to Ali; the mother of this governor is Asma'u bint Umais, who was married to Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, when he was appointed as governor. Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, married her after the death of her husband, Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu. What! If it is wrong to appoint a relative, then how can this be explained?

We want to bring to your attention that we Sunnis do not accuse Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, for what he did; he was right. Public office should be entrusted to whoever qualifies to occupy it without regard to family background or origin;

all that is needed is Islam and competency. But you who accuse Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, of appointing his relatives—what answer will you give in favor of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, regarding the same allegation? We would like to see and ponder this; it might help us use the same defense for Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu.

However, Uthman had more powerful reasons than Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, on many grounds. Among these is that he was not the one who appointed them at the initial stage; he assumed office while they were already serving in their positions and did not change them. Moreover, it was the families of Banu Umayyad whom the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, appointed most frequently during his lifetime as his official staff. He rarely appointed members of Banu Hashim (his family) together with Ali in positions of authority. Yet during Ali's time, they had four governors at once.

THE REPLY

Our professor writes:

The doctrine of Shi'ite accuses Uthman for giving his relations special regard and priority in terms of appointment, and special assignment. This makes them nick named him lover of relatives. Our question is why did Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu also appoint his relatives during his reign?

First, we are pressed to ask where in the "Shi'a doctrine" has Uthman ibn Affan being nicknamed "lover of relatives?" It does not befit rationality to tell a lie for scoring a point.

Second, before we compare Uthman and Ali ibn Abi Taalib's style and criteria of appointment, we need to remind us of the military expedition to Yemen led by Ali. Some of his soldiers [led by Buraydah] on getting to Madinah complained about Ali's decision to the Prophet. Imam al-Tirmidhi documents:

"... So when the expedition arrived, they gave Salam to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and one of the four stood

saying: "O Messenger of Allah! Do you see that Ali bin Abi Talib did such and such." The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) turned away from him. Then the second one stood and said as he said, and he turned away from him. Then the third stood before him, and said as he said, and he turned away from him. Then the fourth stood and said as they had said. The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) faced him, and the anger was visible on his face, he said:

مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ مَا تُرِيدُونَ مِنْ عَلِيٍّ *إِنَّ عَلِيًّا مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْهُ وَهُوَ وَلِيُّ كُلِّ مُؤْمِنٍ بَعْدِي

"What do you want from Ali?! What do you want from Ali?! Indeed, Ali is from me, and I am from him, and he is the Waliy of every believer after me."[326]

The quickest answer to the Professor's polemic question has been given in the reply of the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny), "What do you want from Ali?" However, it is necessary for fairness to take a closer look at the duo's governors. For a fact, there is nothing wrong to give appointment to one's close relative on the condition that he deserves the post on merit. Allah Himself selected Adam, Nuh, progeny of Ibrahim and progeny of Imran above mankind.[327] He (the Most High) made Ibrahim and his progeny the Imams of Mankind.[328] These selections were solely on merit, and not because of family tie.

On the contrary, the son of Prophet Nuh, his wife and the wife of Prophet Lut were stripped off their husband's divine household-ship because of their unrighteousness.

---

[326] Al-Tirmidhi, Jami Sahih Sunan al-Tirmidhi; English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3712; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4077 https://sunnah.com/urn/735910

[327] Sura Aal-Imran: 33 – 34

[328] Sura al-Baqarah: 124

The deceit of our Professor was that he focused on the blood relation of the governors he mentioned with Ali ibn Abi Talib and not their merits.

UTHMAN'S GOVERNORS

It is an historical fact that shortly after the assumption of Uthman to the seat of authority, the Banu Umayyads [Uthman's family] dominated the Caliphal councils and occupy the governorships of all the important provinces.[329] The dominations was not really the problem; rather, these Umayyad governors used powers arbitrarily and unjustly for their own benefits and the benefits of their kinsmen.

- Abdullah ibn Sa'd ibn Abu Sarh – He was Uthman's milk-brother who administered Egypt. He was unpopular amongst the Muslims. He was an early convert but then apostated, and the Prophet had ordered his execution during the conquest of Makkah.[330] Uthman gave him protection and brought him back to Madinah after the demise of the Prophet. It was said he reverted back to Islam.

Imam Abi Dawud documents:

Narrated Sa'd:

On the day when Mecca was conquered, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) gave protection to the People except four men and two women and he named them. Ibn Abu Sarh was one of them.

He then narrated the tradition. He said: Ibn Abu Sarh hid himself with Uthman ibn Affan. When the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) called the people to take the oath of allegiance, he brought him and made him stand

---

[329] Abu Ja'far at-Tabari, *Ta'rikh ar-Rusul wa'l-Muluk* [M. J. de Goeje et al Edition; Leiden 1879 – 1901], vol. 1, pg. 2932 – 3.

[330] Ibid, vol. 1, pg. 2871; Ahmad b. Yahya b. Jabir al-Baladhuri, *Ansab al-Ashraf* [Edition: S. D. F. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936], vol. 5, pg. 49

before the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him). He said: Messenger of Allah, receive the oath of allegiance from him. He raised his head and looked at him thrice, denying him every time. After the third time he received his oath. He then turned to his Companions and said: Is not there any intelligent man among you who would stand to this (man) when he saw me desisting from receiving the oath of allegiance, and kill him? They replied: We do not know, Messenger of Allah, what lies in your heart; did you not give us an hint with your eye? He said: It is not proper for a Prophet to have a treacherous eye.

Abu Dawud said: Abd Allah (b. Abi Sarh) was the foster brother of Uthman, and Walid b. Uqbah was his brother by mother, and Uthman inflicted on him hadd punishment when he drank wine.[331]

حَدَّثَنَا عُثْمَانُ بْنُ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ الْمُفَضَّلِ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَسْبَاطُ بْنُ نَصْرٍ، قَالَ زَعَمَ السُّدِّيُّ عَنْ مُصْعَبِ بْنِ سَعْدٍ، عَنْ سَعْدٍ، قَالَ لَمَّا كَانَ يَوْمُ فَتْحِ مَكَّةَ أَمَّنَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم النَّاسَ إِلاَّ أَرْبَعَةَ نَفَرٍ وَامْرَأَتَيْنِ وَسَمَّاهُمْ وَابْنُ أَبِي سَرْحٍ . فَذَكَرَ الْحَدِيثَ قَالَ وَأَمَّا ابْنُ أَبِي سَرْحٍ فَإِنَّهُ اخْتَبَأَ عِنْدَ عُثْمَانَ بْنِ عَفَّانَ فَلَمَّا دَعَا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم النَّاسَ إِلَى الْبَيْعَةِ جَاءَ بِهِ حَتَّى أَوْقَفَهُ عَلَى رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَقَالَ يَا نَبِيَّ اللَّهِ بَايِعْ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ فَرَفَعَ رَأْسَهُ فَنَظَرَ إِلَيْهِ ثَلاَثًا كُلُّ ذَلِكَ يَأْبَى فَبَايَعَهُ بَعْدَ ثَلاَثٍ ثُمَّ أَقْبَلَ عَلَى أَصْحَابِهِ فَقَالَ أَمَا كَانَ فِيكُمْ رَجُلٌ رَشِيدٌ يَقُومُ إِلَى هَذَا حَيْثُ رَآنِي كَفَفْتُ يَدِي عَنْ بَيْعَتِهِ فَيَقْتُلُهُ فَقَالُوا مَا نَدْرِي يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ أَلاَ أَوْمَأْتَ

---

[331] Sunan Abi Dawud 2683In-book reference : Book 15, Hadith 207English translation : Book 14, Hadith 2677 https://sunnah.com/abudawud/15/207

إِلَيْنَا بِعَيْنِكَ قَالَ إِنَّهُ لاَ يَنْبَغِي لِنَبِيٍّ أَنْ تَكُونَ لَهُ خَائِنَةُ الأَعْيُنِ قَالَ أَبُو دَاوُدَ كَانَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ أَخَا عُثْمَانَ مِنَ الرَّضَاعَةِ وَكَانَ الْوَلِيدُ بْنُ عُقْبَةَ أَخَا عُثْمَانَ لأُمِّهِ وَضَرَبَهُ عُثْمَانُ الْحَدَّ إِذْ شَرِبَ الْخَمْرَ

Grade: Sahih (Al-Albani)

- Al-Walid Ibn Uqbah – According to the above narration, he was Uthman's half-brother [by mother]. He was Uthman's governor in Kufah and he ruled them in a brutal fashion. He divided lands among his favorities and finally disgraced himself by drunkenness.[332] He once led the Muslims in the fajr salat in a state of drunkenness praying four rakaat instead of two. His behaviour and wine excessive consumption riled the Kufans, compeling Uthman to recall him.
- Sa'id Ibn al-'As – Another close relative of Uthman who replaced the drunkard al-walid Ibn Uqbah in Kufah. He infuriated the Kufans by his high-handed treatment, and alarmed them after declaring that the vast and fertile land of kufan Sawad would become a "Qurayshi garden." His abuses of the people of Kufa led to a group of Qurra [Quran reciters] such as Malik b. Harith an-Nakhai, Sulayman b. Surad al-Khuzai, Hujr b. Adi al-Kindi and many others protested against Sa'id's behaviour. Instead of making proper inquiries and act justly, Uthman surmoned the agitators to be sent to Syria for Mu'awiyah to deal with.[333]

---

[332] Abu Ja'far at-Tabari, *Ta'rikh ar-Rusul wa'l-Muluk* [M. J. de Goeje et al Edition; Leiden 1879 – 1901], vol. 1, pg. 2845; Ahmad b. Yahya b. Jabir al-Baladhuri, *Ansab al-Ashraf* [Edition: S. D. F. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936], vol. 5, pg. 31

[333] Ahmad b. Yahya b. Jabir al-Baladhuri, *Ansab al-Ashraf* [Edition: S. D. F. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936], vol. 5, pg. 40

In addition to given juicy appointments to his unworthy relatives, Uthman spent lavishly and gave huge gifts to others.[334] Prominent companions of the Prophet were mistreated harshly and unjustly by Uthman.

For example, Abdullah Ibn mas'ud who was incharge of the treasury in Kufa had a quarrel with the drunkard al-Walid ibn Uqbah. Uthman outsed him of his post after being manhandled in his presence.[335] Worse than this was the treatment met by Ammar Ibn Yasir who was reviled and beaten into unconsciousness when he arrived from Egypt with a letter of complaint against Ibn Abi Sarh.[336] Another noble Sahabi who rose up against Uthman aristocratic government was the fearless Abu Dharr. Uthman could not bear with Abu Dharr's campaign in his opposition. He sent Abu Dharr to Syria but Mu'awiyyah too could not tolerate the pious Abu Dharr. A letter of complaint was sent to Uthman from Mu'awiyah and the Caliph ordered that Abu Dharr should be bound to a wooden camel saddle and be sent back to Madina under escort. He arrived Madinah half dead with his thigh's flesh torn off. Shortly, Abu Dharr was exiled to Ar-Rabdha where he died.[337]

When Uthman policy could no longer be tolerated, the Muslims from Egypt to Kufa and other cities rose up against him.

Imām Ibn al-Athīr states:

---

[334] Ibid, vol. 5, pg. 27; Ibid (Tabari), vol. 1, pg. 2953

[335] Ahmad b. Yahya b. Jabir al-Baladhuri, *Ansab al-Ashraf* [Edition: S. D. F. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936], vol. 5, pg. 36

[336] Ibid, vol. 5, pg. 48; Abu A'la Mawdudi, *Khilafah wa Mulukiyyah* [Lahore, 1966], pg. 105

[337] Ahmad b. Yahya b. Jabir al-Baladhuri, *Ansab al-Ashraf* [Edition: S. D. F. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936], vol. 5, pg. 52; Abu Ja'far at-Tabari, *Ta'rikh ar-Rusul wa'l-Muluk* [M. J. de Goeje et al Edition; Leiden 1879 – 1901], vol. 1, pg. 2858.

'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays ... He was a Sahābī, and he witnessed the bay'ah of al-Ridwān, and gave the bay'ah there. HE WAS THE COMMANDER OF THE ARMY that came from Egypt to besiege 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, may Allāh be pleased with him, WHEN THEY MURDERED HIM.[338]

عبد الرحمن بن عديس ابن عمرو بن عبيد بن كلاب بن دهمان بن غنم بن هميم بن ذهل بن هني بن بلي كذا نسبه ابن منده وأبو نعيم وهو بلوي له صحبة وشهد بيعة الرضوان وبايع فيها وكان أمير الجيش القادمين من مصر لحصر عثمان ابن عفان رضي الله عنه لما قتلوه

In order to cover up Caliph Uthman's faults, and the fact that notable Sahabah mobilised campaigns against the Caliph and eventually killed him, an imaginary and legendary figure called Abdullah Ibn Saba[339] was fabricated and was credited to have orchestrated all the Muslim's cities' campaigns, riots, besieging and murder of the Caliph.

---

[338] Refer to chapter 14 for references and details.

[339] There is no single authentic narration in the entire Ahlu Sunnah books of athar about Abdullah Ibn Saba. More than 90% of narrations about him were narrated by Sayf ibn Umar who was agreed upon by all Sunni hadith scientists to be liar and fabricator.

ALI'S GOVERNORS

Relative governors appointed by Ali Ibn Abi Taalib are as follows:

- Abdullah ibn Abbas – a well known companion of the Prophet. He was known for his knowledge of the Quran and Sunnah of the Prophet. He was Ali's governor at Basra.
- Ubaydullah ibn Abbas – He was the younger brother of Abdullah (b. Abbas) and also a companion of the Prophet. He transmitted ahadith from the Prophet. He was Ali's governor in Yemen.
- Qutham ibn Abbas – He was also counted amongst the companions of Allah's Messenger. He was described of having semblance with the Messenger of Allah after al-Hasan ibn Ali. He was Ali's Governor of Makkah and conducted the Hajj.
- Ma'bad ibn Abbas – According to Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani[340] quoting Ibn Abd al-Barr, Ma'bad was a little boy at the lifetime of the Prophet and did not hear (transmit) from him. He died in Africa during the reign of Uthman at 35 H. Some say he died there after that [reign of Uthman][341] during the reign of Mu'awiyyah.
- Ja'dah bin Hubayrah bin Abi Wahb – He was the son of Umm Hani bint Abi Taalib. There is dispute to his companionship with the Prophet. Some [like al-Bukhari] are of the opinion he was a child at the lifetime of the Prophet and did not hear from him. Others like al-Ijli, Ibn Hibban et al graded him as a

---

[340] Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah* [Dar al-Kutub al-Illmiyyah, Beirut; 1st Edition], vol.6, pg. 207

[341] If he died during the reign of Uthman, then he cannot be said to have served Ali ibn Abi Taalib.

trustworthy Tabi'. He was the governor of Khurasan during the reign of Ali ibn Abi Talib.[342]

Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr – He was a companion of the Prophet, the son of the first Caliph Abu Bakr who later became step-son of Ali ibn Abi Talib. He was trained by Ali. He was very active in the uprising against Caliph Uthman. He became Ali's governor in Egypt. He was a loyal servant and pious man.[343]

Imam Tabari records his final moment when Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan ordered his killing:

'Mu'awiyah [ibn Hudayj] said to him, "I am only slaying you in retaliation for [the death of] Uthman." Muhammad asked him, "What have you got to do with Uthman? He [Uthman] acted unjustly and rejected the authority [hukm] of the Quran, and God has said, 'They who do not judge with what God has revealed, they are the iniquitous." We held that against him and killed him, but you give him merit for it, you and those who are like you. God has absolved us – God willing – from his sin [dhanb], but you share in his offense (ithm) and the enormity of his sin, and the one who uses you [i.e Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan] is just the same."97

And indeed, Uthman acted unjustly and rejected the authority [hukm] of the Qur'an. Imam al-Bukhari documents:

حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ سُوقَةَ، عَنْ مُنْذِرٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ الْحَنَفِيَّةِ، قَالَ لَوْ كَانَ عَلِيٌّ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ ذَاكِرًا عُثْمَانَ ـ رضى

---

[342] Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah* [Dar al-Kutub al-Illmiyyah, Beirut; 1st Edition], vol.1, pg. 628

[343] Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah* [Dar al-Kutub al-Illmiyyah, Beirut; 1st Edition], vol.6, pg. 193 – 194

الله عنه ـ ذَكَرَهُ يَوْمَ جَاءَهُ نَاسٌ فَشَكَوْا سُعَاةَ عُثْمَانَ، فَقَالَ لِي عَلِيٌّ اذْهَبْ إِلَى عُثْمَانَ فَأَخْبِرْهُ أَنَّهَا صَدَقَةُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم، فَمُرْ سُعَاتَكَ يَعْمَلُونَ فِيهَا. فَأَتَيْتُهُ بِهَا فَقَالَ أَغْنِهَا عَنَّا. فَأَتَيْتُ بِهَا عَلِيًّا فَأَخْبَرْتُهُ فَقَالَ ضَعْهَا حَيْثُ أَخَذْتَهَا.

Narrated Ibn Al-Hanafiya:

If `Ali had spoken anything about `Uthman, then he would have mentioned the day when some persons came to him and complained about the Zakat officials of `Uthman. `Ali then said to me, "Go to `Uthman and say to him, 'This document contains the regulations of spending the Sadaqa of Allah's Apostle so order your Zakat officials to act accordingly." I took the document to `Uthman. `Uthman said, "Take it away, for we are not in need of it." I returned to `Ali with it and informed him of that. He said, "Put it whence you took it.[344]

Imagine the audacity! While Imam Ali tries to guide Uthman and his Zakat officials based on the Sunnah of the Prophet, he rejected it and boasted to continue with his corrupt officials on their ways. That is the summary of comparism between Uthman and Ali's appointed officials.

However, the Professor made a last failed attempt:

We want to bring to your notice that we the Sunni do not accuse Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu and what he did. he was right. Because public office should be entrusted to whoever qualify to occupy it without regard to his family background or his origin, all which is needed is his Islam and competency. But you that accuse Uthman Radiyallahu Anhu for appointing his relations, then what answer will you give in favour of Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu on the same allegation for we to see and ponder, it might aid us to use the same defense for Uthman Radiyallahu Anhu.

Had the Professor being truthful and sincere, he would not even attempt to bring up this kind of question. All of Ali's appointees were sahabah of the Prophet [or pious and righteous tabi'een] who were not found guilty or abuse

---

[344] Refer to chapter 14 for references and details.

Reference: Sahih al-Bukhari 3111; In-book reference: Book 57, Hadith 20; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 4, Book 53, Hadith 343. https://sunnah.com/bukhari:3111

their offices unlike Uthman's appointees. Lastly, the Professor made his final excuse:

But Uthman has powerful reasons than Ali Radiyallahu Anhu for many grounds. Among which is that he was not the one that appointed them at the initial stage, he assumes office while they were serving the office they held, and he didn't change them.

Apart from Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan [cousin of Uthman, and of the same Banu Umayyad] who had been the governor of Syria since the reign of Umar, all other governors of various provinces were changed and new ones were appointed by Uthman. And even if we assumed that he inherited those governors and did not change them [which he obviously did], isn't it the duty of the Caliph to instill orderliness, justice, righteousness and fear of God; and remove any guilty and corrupt public office holder; and acts in line with the Qur'an and Sunnah of the Prophet, salallahu alayhi wa aalihi?

CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

RELATIONSHIP WITH "APOSTATES"

Question 41:

In most of your books, among which are "Kashful Gummah" by al-Irbili, "Biharul Anwar" of Majlisi, and "Manaqib" of Khuwarizmi, it is narrated that Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, helped Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, with the dowry of his wife Fatima, Radiyallahu Anhu. Why should he accept such a kind gesture from an unbeliever or apostate and an enemy of Allah, as you always claim?

REPLY

First, it is necessary to quickly talk about the nature of the books mentioned by the Professor.

- Kashf al-Ghumma fi marifah al-Aimmah – written by Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn E'esa al-Irbili (d. 692 H), a great Shia scholar of hadith and history. He wrote Kashf al-Ghumma to describe the virtues, karama and life-history of the Imams of the Ahl al-Bayt. He gathered and used both Sunni and Shi'i ahadith and historical sources throughout his descriptions.
- Bihar al-Anwar – written by Allamah Muhammad al-Baqir al-Majlisi (d. 1110 H). One of the most famous Shi'i figures in fiqh and hadith. The book Bihar al-Anwar is a monumental work of 110 volumes where he gathered all available ahadith – Sunni and Shi'a hadith alike – with the aim of preserving ahadith. Therefore, the author did not concern himself with the hukm [grading] of ahadith he collected.
- Al-Manaqib or Manaqib Khawarizmi – written by Imam Muwaffaq b. Ahmad al-Khawarizmi (d. 568 H). He was a Sunni jurist and muhadith. He wrote the book [al-Manaqib] to gather Ali ibn Abi Talib's virtues in 30 sections.

Now to the point of our dear Professor:

Abu al-Hasan Ali Irbili (d. 692 H) in his book Kashf al-Ghumma under the heading: [في ذكر تزويجه (عليه السلام) فاطمة سيدة نساء العالمين (عليها السلام) – Mentioning his (Ali's) marriage with Fatimah, leader of the women of the worlds] documents:

"From Manaqib al-Khawarizmi, narrated from Ali who said: ...

... :من مناقب الخوارزمي عن علي قال

... Ali said: So I set out and sold it [Ali's armor] for four hundred black dirhams, from Uthman bin Affan, and when I took the dirhams from him and the shield was taken from me, he said: O Abu Al-Hassan, I am not more worthy of the shield than you and you are more worthy of a dirham than I am. I said: Yes. He [Uthman] said: "The shield is a gift from me to you," so, I took the shield and the dirhams, and came to the Messenger of God (may God bless him and his family), so I put the shield and the dirhams in his hands and told him what was Uthman's order, then he (the Messenger of Allah) called for him...[345]

قال علي: فانطلقت فبعته بأربعمائة درهم سود هجرية، من عثمان بن عفان فلما قبضت الدراهم منه وقبض الدرع مني قال: يا أبا الحسن لست أولى بالدرع منك وأنت أولى بالدراهم مني، فقلت بلى، قال: فإن الدرع هدية مني إليك فأخذت الدرع والدراهم، وأقبلت إلى رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وآله) فطرحت الدرع والدراهم بين يديه وأخبرته بما كان من أمر عثمان، فدعا له بخير.

That was the "help" our professor talked about. This Sunni report [from the Sunni book – Manaqib Khawarizmi] is

[345] Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn E'esa al-Irbili, Kashf al-Ghummah fi marifah al-Aimmah (Dar al-Taarif, Beirut, 1433) [annotator: Ali Aali Kawthar], vol. 1, of. 642

exactly what Allamah al-Majlisi also documents99 albeit from the book of Abu al-Hasan Ali al-Irbili. Therefore, how is a Sunni report a hujjah against the Shi'a?

Second, apart from the fact that the hadith has no known authentic sanad [chain of transmitter], the epithet "abu al-Hasan" used throughout the story made it more suspicious of its authenticity. How can Uthman ibn Affan refer to Ali ibn Abi Talib as "Abu al-Hasan" when he is yet to tie the knot not to mention of having a child called "al-Hasan;" and according to both Sunni and Shi'a[346] narrations, it was only when the Prophet of Allah named his grandson "al-Hasan" that Ali became to be known as

"Abu al-Hasan." He was never called with such epithet before his first child al-Hasan was born.

Third, even if we accept the story to be true, the point of our professor can still never hold. This is because the marriage of Bibi Fatima and Imam Ali took place during the lifetime of the Prophet [peace be upon him and his progeny] and what the Shi'a accused the first three Caliphs [usurpation of Khilafah – vis-à-vis "apostacy according to the Professor's claim] including Uthman ibn Affan of only happened after the demise of the Prophet.

Question 42:

Why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, send his children Al-Hassan and Al-Hussain to counter the attack of the rebels who came to assassinate Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu? This is evident in both Sunni and Shi'ite books; refer to "Tarikhul Umam" by Tabari, particularly the section on what happened during the thirty-second year of Hijra, as well as "Muruj al-Dhahab" by Masudi (2/344).

Why should Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, send his children to defend and protect an apostate/unbeliever and a tyrant

---

[346] Allamah al-Majlisi, Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 43, pg. 129 – 130; About the naming of al-Hasan and al-Husein [Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 43, pg. 238]

who denied the Prophet's household their rights (power)? He should have allowed the coup d'état so that he could claim his rights easily. If you disagree with this story and assert that he did nothing during the attack against Uthman, what will you say to the Khawarij in response to their allegation that he (Ali) was responsible for the coup in order to attain leadership of the Ummah?

THE REPLY

Our Professor continues to believe in his feeble claim that Shia creed believed [the Caliphs including] Uthman to be unbeliever. This issue has been laid to rest in previous chapter[347] However, the real intent of the Professor is revealed when he says:

Why should Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu send his children to defend and apostate/unbeliever, and a tyrant that denied the Prophet household their right (power). He should have allowed the coup de-tat for him to claim his right easily.

For Ali ibn Abi Talib to have ordered his beloved two sons, the grandsons of the Prophet – al-Hasan and al-Husein, to guard the life of the Caliph [which is even controversial] simply showed who he really was. Ali was the head of Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet "whom Allah has removed al-Rijz [all forms of physical and spiritual diseases] from them, and purified them with absolute purification."[348]

Obviously, to an ordinary man with spiritual diseases of the heart, the riot and the siege that eventually led to the murder of the Caliph would be a perfect opportunity to get rid of the Caliph making his own assumption to power closer. But the "self of the Prophet" – Ali ibn Abi Talib – is far from such lowly attitude. If it is part of Prophetic rules of engagement [during war] that a kaafir [unbeliever] should be given protection if he surrenders and sought protection, then how come someone who professes shahadatayn would not be protected at the verge of death?

---

[347] Chaper 30

[348] Surah al-Ahzab, verse 33.

May the peace and blessing of Allah be upon Muhammad and his ahl al-Bayt, the purified.

Question 43:

You believe that Mu'awiyah, Radiyallahu Anhu, is an unbeliever. Why then did Al-Hassan give him leadership of the Muslim Ummah? He appointed him as a successor to the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam. After the assassination of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, the Muslim Ummah, especially those in Kufah, reached a consensus that Al-Hassan should be the new leader, and they pledged their allegiance to him. However, Shi'ites disagree with this. Their belief is that it is an appointment by the outgoing leader who appointed his son as his successor, i.e. Ali. This is against the backdrop of the actions of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman.

Al-Hassan assumed the mantle of authority and after six months invited Mu'awiyah and gave him leadership by stepping down willingly; this was just for peace to prevail. He compelled his people (the people of Kufah) to obey the new leader.

Did Al-Hassan, whom you claim is infallible, step aside for an unbeliever to lead the Muslim Ummah? Or is it that Mu'awiyah, Radiyallahu Anhu, is a Muslim but you charge him with false accusations?

THE REPLY

The question of al-Hasan abdication has been duly answered in chapter 19 [of this book].

As per Kufr [disbelief] of Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan, no one says it better than a grand Sunni Imam, Ali ibn Ja'd.[349]

---

[349] Imam Dhahabi writes:

152 – Ali bin Ja'd

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents:

وسمعت ابا عبد الله وقال له دلويه سمعت علي بن الجعد يقول: مات والله معاوية على غير ملة الاسلام

I heard from Abaa Abdillah, and he was told by Dalaway: he heard Ali ibn Ja'd who said: By Allah! Mu'aawiyah died upon other than Islam.[350]

And Hafiz al-Haythami (d. 807H) documents a beautiful narration:

وعن سعد بن حذيفة قال : قال عمار بن ياسر يوم صفين وذكر أمرهم وأمر الصلح فقال : والله ما أسلموا ولكن استسلموا وأسروا الكفر فلما رأوا عليه أعوانا أظهروه

رواه الطبراني في الكبير وسعد بن حذيفة لم أر من ترجمه

On the authority of Saad bin Hudhaifah, he said: Ammar bin Yasir said on the day of [battle of] Siffin, and he mentioned their [MU'awiyyah and his troop's] matter and

---

Ibn Ubayd, al-Imam al-Hafiz al-Hujjah (the leader, the memorizer, the proof) of Musnad Baghdad, Abu al-Hasan al-Baghdadi al-Jawhariy Mawla Bani Hashim. He was born in the year 134 H.

He heard from Shu'bah, and Ibn Abi Dhab, and Ariiz ibn Uthman, one of the youngest tabi'een, and Jarir ibn Aazim, and Sufyan Thawri, and ...

Narrated from him (are): **Al-Bukhari**, Abu Dawud, Yahya ibn Ma'in, ... Ahmad ibn Hanbal ..."

Source: Shamsudeen Muhammad ibn Ahmad ad-Dhahabi, *Siyar A'lam al-Nubalah* (Muasasah al-Risalah, Beirut, 1st Edition)[annotator: Shuaib al-Arnaut], vol. 10, p.459 – 468.

[350] *Masa'il Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal* [Riwaayat Ishaq ibn Ibrahim ibn Haani an-Naysaburi], page 154, hadith no. 1866

the matter of peace, so he said: By God, they [Mu'awiyyah and his troops] did not convert to Islam, but [they] surrendered and concealed disbelief, and when they saw aides against it, they revealed it (their disbelief).

Al-Tabarani narrated it in Al-Kabeer, and I did not see Saad bin Hudhayfah in biography book.[351]

Hafiz al-Haythami might have deny the identity of Saad Ibn Hudhayfah, but other scholars of Rijal document him. For example, Imam Ibn Hibban writes:

سعد بْن حُذَيْفَة بْن الْيَمَان الْعَبْسِي عداده فِي أهل الْكُوفَة يروي عَن أَبِيه روى عَنهُ مُنْذر الثَّوْريّ وَزِيَاد بْن علاقَة

S'ad bin Hudhayfah bin al-Yamaan al-'Absi is counted among the people of Kufa, and he narrates on the authority of his father [Hudhayfah, sahabi of the Prophet]. Mundhir al-Thawri and Ziyad bin Ala'ah narrated from him.[352]

---

[351] *Majmau al-Zawaaid wa manbau al-Fawaaid* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1412H)[annotator: Abdullah Muhammad Darwish], vol. 1, pg. 308 Hadith 439

[352] Ibn Hibban, *al-Thiqăt*: http://hadithtransmitters.hawramani.com/سعد-بن-حذيفة-بن-اليمان/

SHI'A AND THE SAHABAH

[May Allah be pleased with them]

CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN

DID THE SAHABAH APOSTATIZED?

On this section, the Professor gives an introductory background:

It is part of Shi'ite doctrine that all the companions of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, apostatized after his lifetime but they exclude very few. Some are of the opinion that only three or four companions apostatized; at most, they believe thirteen companions did so. However, among these thirteen are not included the in-laws of the Prophet, his wives, or other relatives.

Then, his next question follows:

Question 44:

If one apostatizes, he has to change from one religion to another. If the companions apostatized, from which religion did they change? Is it from the religion of Shi'ism?

Were they initially Shi'ite and then apostatized to Sunni? If the religion of Shi'ism was not in existence during their time, then from what religion did they apostatize? But if you claim that they changed from Islam, what then was the new religion they embraced?

THE REPLY

First, it is very interesting how the Ahlu al-Hadith [the Salafiyyah] of Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal [influencing other sects of Ahlu Sunnah] formulated the rigid and passionate doctrine of believing in the uprightness of all the sahabah of the noble Prophet. This is the central belief of the Salafiyyah, and their vital argument has always been that casting doubt or accusing "the sahabah" of any negativity is an indirect attack on the noble Qur'an and Sunnah of the Prophet which they preserved and transmitted to us collectively. Further arguments are that attacking any of them is undermining:

- their great services to Islam of which "Allah has pleased with them all"
- the sayings of the Prophet: "do not abuse my sahabah" and similar sayings.

On the other hand, Shi'i true belief is that:

- there were Munafiqeen [hypocrites] – known and unknown, from the ranks of the sahabah many of which outlived the Prophet
- there were some sahabah who turned innovators and renegade after the demise of the noble Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny
- there were righteous, pious and impeccables sahabah

Therefore, going by these two opposing and irreconcilable beliefs, should the opponents of the Shi'a [like our amiable Professor] want to introduce Shi'a belief about the sahabah, they say:

It is part of the Shi'ite doctrine that all the companions of the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi sallam apostated after his life time but they exclude very few.

In sha Allah, in this chapter, from the definition of [Suhbah] vis-à-vis sahabah to the Quranic and ahadith perspectives about them, from both schools [Sunni and Shia], with respect to their beliefs and disbeliefs will be discussed. Thereafter, we can establish from the aforementioned discussions the correct meaning of "apostasy [ridah]" as used in the context of both Sunni and Shi'i ahadith with respect to the sahabah after the demise of the Prophet.

WHO IS A SAHABI?

Putting Shi'i thought aside for a while, there are two contradicting definition of Sahabi in Ahlu Sunnah's thoughts and views. For example, amongst the earliest Sunni scholars define "sahabi" thus:

Imam Ahmad [d. 241 H] says:

كل من صحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم سنة أو شهرا أو يوما أو رآه مؤمنا به فهو من أصحابه له من أصحابة بقدر ذلك

Whoever accompanied the Prophet (peace be upon him) for a year or a month or a day or saw him, believed in him, he's from his Sahabah; he is from the sahabah as much as that. [Masaail Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal, vol. 1, pg. 4669, no. 3324]

Likewise, Imam al-Bukhari [d. 256 H] gives a similar definition:

من صحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أو رأه من المسلمين فهو من أصحابه

Whoever accompanied the Prophet (peace be upon him) or saw him from amongst the Muslims, he's from his sahabah. [Sahih al-Bukhari, kitab Fadail Sahabah]

This definition was the definition of earliest Sunni scholars as Imam an-Nawawi [d. 676 H] says in yet his own definition:

فأما الصحابى فكل مسلم رأى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولو لحظة. هذا هو الصحيح في حده وهو مذهب أحمد بن حنبل وأبى عبد الله البخارى فى صحيحه والمحدثين كافة.

Then as for "as-Sahaabah"; [then it is] every Muslim who saw the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) even within a moment. This is correct in its accuracy and it is the madhhab [thought, believe] of Ahmad ibn Hanbal and Aba Abdillah al-Bukhari in his Sahih and all the Muhaditheen [hadith scholars].[353]

Points gathered from these earlier Sunni definitions are:

- Any Muslim who saw or accompanied the Prophet even within a moment is a Sahabi
- This definition of "any Muslim" include the Mu'mineen (true believers) and the Munafiqeen (the hypocrites)
- This definition is the "consensus" of the earlier Sunni scholars especially the hadith experts.

However, when al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani [d. 852 H] surfaced, he added an extra line to the previous definitions which brought a new thought. He writes:

كل من لقيه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في حياته مؤمنا به و مات على الإسلام

[353] Abu Zakariyyah Yahya ibn Sharaf al-Nawawi, *Sahih Muslim bi Sharh al-Nawawi* [1st Edition, 1347 H], vol. 1, pg. 35 – 36.

Whoever met the Prophet (peace be upon him) during his lifetime, and believe in him and died upon Islam.[354]

This definition with the last line limits the sahabah to only "the believers" leaving out "the hypocrites" who were actually Kuffar (disbelievers) and only used Islam as shield.[355] For a fact, any Munafiq who dies, died upon kufr not upon Islam.[356] This definition is what the Salafiyyah stood upon to establish:

- that all the sahabah were righteous and were people of Jannah
- the Munafiqun (hypocrites) can not be, or were no longer sahabah
- Any mistake or wrong judgement (no matter how severe) of a Sahabi is forgiven.[357]

Therefore, judging by these two conflicting [Sahabi] definitions of the Ahlu Sunnah, if we are to stand on the first definition [of Ahmad, al-Bukhari et al], Shi'a would be right to group the sahabah into the good, the bad and the ugly. On the other hand, if we are to use the second definition [of Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani]; then Shi'a would be

---

[354] Al-Hafiz Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi tamyiz al-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Illmiyyah, 1st Edition 1415 H) [Annotators: Adil Ahmad Abd al-Mawjud and Ali Muhammad Mu'awadh], vol. 1, pg. 158

[355] Surah al-Munafiqun: 2

[356] Surah al-Munafiqun: 3

[357] This is a fanatical thought. For example, Sahabah cursed, fought and killed each other intentionally. While it is haram to curse a believer, whosoever killed a believer intentionally is destined for hell-fire [sura Nisa: 93]. In Ahlu Sunnah doctrine, the killer and the killed [sahabah] will both enter paradise since they both did Ijtihad. The inconsistency and confusion of Ahlu Sunnah's doctrines about the Sahabah is insurmountable. On one hand, those sahabah who [did not pay allegiance and] refused to pay "zakat" to Abu Bakr and were killed are said to be Mur'tad [apostates] while those who broke or refused to pay allegiance to Ali ibn Abi Talib and fought him killing several sahabah in the process are said to be doing "ijtihad" and will be rewareded with goodness. On the other hand, those sahabah who rose up, biseged and murdered Uthman are condemned and cursed.

wrong counting the Munafiqeen among the sahabah. So, which of the two definitions is correct?

LEAVING WITH THE CONSEQUENCES

There is nothing which quickly bursts the Salafiyyah's bubbles saves citing examples of certain individuals who were confirmed Sahabah as per their historical data, and were either Munafiqeen (hypocrites) or had been certified by the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his household) as inhabitants of hell fire. For brevity, three examples are cited below:

- Tha'labah ibn Hatib

Ibn Sa'd writes:

ثَعْلَبَة بن حاطب بن عمرو بن عبيد بن أمية بن... وآخى رَسُولُ اللَّهِ - - صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ - بَيْنَ ثَعْلَبَة بْن حاطب ومعتب بْن الحمراء من خزاعة حليف بني مخزوم. وشهد ثَعْلَبَة بْن حاطب بدْرًا وأحدًا

Tha'labah bin Hatib bin Amr bin Obaid bin Umayyah ibn... And the Messenger of Allah – may Allah's prayers and peace be upon him - fraternized between Tha'labah bin Hatib and Mutab bin Al-Hamra from Khuza'ah, an ally of Banu Makhzoom. Tha'labah bin Hatib witnessed Badr and Uhud.[358]

Tha'labah was not an ordinary sahabi, but amongst the "foremost" of the Muhajireen who witnessed the battle of Badr and Uhud. Therefore, by the standard of the Salafiyyah, he was a true believer and can never be a Munafiq. However, he was amongst the Munafiqeen.

Allah, the Most High says in His glorious book:

---

[358] Ibn Sa'd, al-Tabaqat al-Kubra (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah), vol.3, pg. 301: Under the biography of Tha'labah ibn Hatib

وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مَسْجِدًا ضِرَارًا وَكُفْرًا وَتَفْرِيقًا بَيْنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَإِرْصَادًا لِّمَنْ حَارَبَ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ مِن قَبْلُ وَلَيَحْلِفُنَّ إِنْ أَرَدْنَا إِلَّا الْحُسْنَىٰ وَاللَّهُ يَشْهَدُ إِنَّهُمْ لَكَاذِبُونَ

And those who built a masjid to cause harm and for unbelief and to cause disunion among the believers and an ambush to him who made war against Allah and His Apostle before; and they will certainly swear: We did not desire aught but good; and Allah bears witness that they are most surely liars. (Surah At-Taubah, Verse 107)

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir writes in his Tafsir:

وَنَزَلَ فِيهِمْ مِنَ الْقُرْآنِ مَا نَزَلَ: ﴿وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مَسْجِدًا ضِرَارًا وَكُفْرًا﴾ إِلَى آخِرِ الْقِصَّةِ. وَكَانَ الَّذِينَ بَنَوْهُ اثْنَيْ عَشَرَ رَجُلًا خُذَامُ بْنُ خَالِدٍ، مِنْ بَنِي عُبَيد بْنِ زَيْدٍ، أَحَدُ بَنِي عَمْرِو بْنِ عَوْفٍ، وَمِنْ دَارِهِ أُخْرِجَ مَسْجِدُ الشِّقَاقِ، وَثَعْلَبَةُ بْنُ حَاطِبٍ مِنْ بَنِي عُبَيْدٍ وَهُوَ إِلَى بَنِي أُمَيَّةَ بْنِ زَيْدٍ، ...ومعتِّب بْنُ قُشير، مِنْ [بَنِي] ضُبَيعة بْنِ زَيْدٍ،

And He revealed to them from the Qur'an what was revealed: {And those who built a masjid to cause harm and for unbelief and to cause disunion among the believers... (Quran 9: 107)} to the end of the story.

Those who built it were twelve men, Khudham bin Khalid, from Banu Ubayd bin Zaid, one of Banu Amr bin Auf, and from his house he brought out the Mosque of Al-Shiqaq, and Tha'labah bin Hatib from Banu Ubayd, who belonged to Banu Umayyah bin Zaid, Mu'tib bin Qushayr....[359]

- Abu al-Ghādiyah al-Juhayni

The noble Prophet is reported to have said in an authentic hadith that:

---

[359] Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Azeem*, under surah at-Tawbah verse 107

قاتل عمار و سالبه في النار.

"The murderer and attacker of 'Ammār will be in the Hell-Fire."

While some Ahlu Sunnah's scholars of the past and present are economical with the truth, Sheikh Nasir al-Din al-Albani displayed an enviable and unprejudiced level of academic maturity as he writes on the above authentic hadith thus:

هذا إسناد صحيح , رجاله ثقات رجال مسلم , و أبو الغادية هو الجهني و هو صحابي كما أثبت ذلك جمع, و قد قال الحافظ في آخر ترجمته من " الإصابة " بعد أن ساق الحديث , و جزم ابن معين بأنه قاتل عمار: " و الظن بالصحابة في تلك الحروب أنه كانوا فيها متأولين , و للمجتهد المخطىء أجر , و إذا ثبت هذا في حق آحاد الناس , فثبوته للصحابة بالطريق الأولى " .

و أقول: هذا حق , لكن تطبيقه على كل فرد من أفرادهم مشكل لأنه يلزم تناقض القاعدة المذكورة بمثل حديث الترجمة , إذ لا يمكن القول بأن أبا غادية القاتل لعمار مأجور لأنه قتله مجتهدا , و رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول: " قاتل عمار في النار "

This chain is sahīh, its narrators are narrators of (Sahīh) Muslim. Abū al-Ghādiyah is al-Juhanī, AND HE WAS A SAHĀBĪ AS AFFIRMED BY ALL. Al-Hāfiz has said at the end of his biography of Abū al-Ghādiyah in al-Isābah, after citing the above hadīth and the categorical declaration of Ibn Ma'īn that ABŪ AL-GHĀDIYAH WAS THE MURDERER OF 'AMMĀR:

"The Sahābah, in these wars, thought that they were interpreting the texts; and for every mujtahid that makes a mistake there is a reward. Since this principle is well established for the common people, then it is even more established for the Sahābah."

I (al-Albānī) say: This is true. However, applying the principle to every single one of them is objectionable because it will contradict the principle established in the hadīth. It is NOT permitted to say that Abū al-Ghādiyah, THE MURDERER OF 'AMMĀR, will have a good reward because he MURDERED in ijtihād while Allāh's Apostle, peace be upon him, has said: "The murderer of 'Ammār will be in the Hell-Fire."[360]

- Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays

One of Ahlu Sunnah's grand and foremost Imams, Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi, writes about the murderers of Uthman ibn Affan:

وليس هذا كقتلة عثمان رضي الله عنه لأنهم لا مجال للاجتهاد في قتله لأنه لم يقتل أحدا ولا حارب ولا قاتل ولا دافع ولا زنى بعد إحصان ولا ارتد فيسوغ المحاربة تأويل بل هم فساق محاربون سافكون دما حراما عمدا بلا تأويل على سبيل الظلم والعدوان فهم فساق ملعون.

This however was not like the murder of 'Uthmān, may Allāh be pleased with him. There was no possibility of ijtihād in his murder. This is because he did not murder or fight anyone. He neither attacked nor defended, nor committed adultery or apostasy such as would have permitted tāwīl. Rather, they (his murderers) were ARMED EVIL DOERS, PEOPLE WHO DELIBERATELY SHED THE BLOOD OF THE

---

[360] Muhammad Nāsir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *al-Silsilah al-Ahādīth al-Sahīhah* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif), vol. 5, p. 18, # 2008

INNOCENT, WITHOUT TĀWĪL, IN INJUSTICE AND ENMITY. THEY WERE ACCURSED EVIL-DOERS![361]

Ibn Hazm did not stop there. He goes a step further by cursing these murderers. He writes:

فقتلوه ولا خير من ذلك عند أحد لعن الله من قتله والراضين بقتله فما رضي أحد منهم قط بقتله.

They (i.e Uthman's murderers) murdered him, and there was no good in that in the view of any one. May Allāh curse his murderers and whosoever is pleased with his murder. There was no one at all who was pleased with his murder.[362]

So, the question is who was the mastermind of this "accursed" killer group? He was no other than a Sahabi by the name of Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays. The Sunni ace Imam, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr writes:

عبد الرحمن بن عديس البلوي مصري شهد الحديبية ذكر أسد ابن موسى عن ابن لهيعة عن يزيد بن أبي حبيب قال كان عبد الرحمن بن عديس البلوي ممن بايع تحت الشجرة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال أبو عمر هو كان الأمير على الجيش القادمين من مصر إلى المدينة الذين حصروا عثمان وقتلوه

'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays al-Balawī al-Misrī: He witnessed al-Hudaybiyyah. Asad b. Mūsā mentioned from Ibn Lahī'ah, from Yazīd b. Abī Habīb, who said: "'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Udays al-Balawī was one of those who gave bay'ah to the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, under the Tree". Abū 'Umar said, "He was the COMMANDER of the army that came from Egypt to

---

[361] Abū Muhammad 'Alī b. Ahmad b. Sa'īd b. Hazm al-Zāhirī, *al-Fisal* (Cairo: Maktabah al-Khanajī], vol. 4, p. 125

[362] Abū Muhammad 'Alī b. Ahmad b. Sa'īd b. Hazm al-Zāhirī, al-Fisal (Cairo: Maktabah al-Khanajī], vol. 4, p. 123

Madīnah, the army that besieged 'Uthmān AND MURDERED HIM."[363]

Those were very few examples of the bad guys. Despite the fact that they were confirmed Sahabah, will the Salafiyyah evict them from the rank and file of the Sahabah for the consistency of their belief that all the Sahabah were righteous, believers and people of Jannah? This already exposed the Salafi's pseudo-understanding of "sahabah" based on Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani's definition.

FROM THE QUR'ANIC AND AHADITH PERSPECTIVE

From the Quranic and hadith perspectives, all the Muslims who "surround" and "keep company (suhbah) with" the Prophet are regarded as his Sahabah. For example:

And (as for) the foremost, the first of the Muhajirs and the Ansars, and those who followed them in goodness, Allah is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, to abide in them for ever; that is the mighty achievement.

وَالسَّابِقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُم بِإِحْسَانٍ
رَّضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتَهَا الْأَنْهَارُ
خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

And from among those who surround you of the dwellers of the desert there are hypocrites, and from among the people of Medina (also); they are stubborn in hypocrisy; you do not know them; We know them; We will chastise them twice then shall they be turned back to a grievous chastisement.[364]

---

[363] Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Barr, *al-Isti'āb fi Ma'rifah al-Sahābah* (Beirut: Dār al-Jayl; 1st edition, 1412 H) [annotator: 'Alī Muhammad al-Bajāwe], vol. 2, p. 840, # 1437

[364] Surah al-Tawbah: 100 – 101

وَمِمَّنْ حَوْلَكُم مِّنَ الْأَعْرَابِ مُنَافِقُونَ وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ مَرَدُوا عَلَى النِّفَاقِ لَا تَعْلَمُهُمْ نَحْنُ نَعْلَمُهُمْ سَنُعَذِّبُهُم مَّرَّتَيْنِ ثُمَّ يُرَدُّونَ إِلَىٰ عَذَابٍ عَظِيمٍ

There is no doubt from these noble verses that all of "the Muhajirs and the Ansars" constituted "the people of Madinah" who were Sahabah. Interestingly, when these verses were revealed, Madinah was a full-blown Muslim state. And by extension, Allah includes the "desert Arabs" as part of "those who surround" the Prophet. Therefore, Quran state it with clarity that "the People of Madinah – the Ansar and the Muhajirs," that is "the sahabah" are divided into:

- The true believers, and The Munafiqeen [hypocrites]

On this verse, Imam Dhahabi [d. 748 H] writes:

There were LOTS OF PEOPLE, during the days of the Prophet, peace be upon him, who were regarded as his Sahābah and the followers of his religion, but who were in reality hidden hypocrites. The Prophet of Allāh, peace be upon him, did not know them, and he was NOT made to know them (by Allāh): "And so are some among the people of Madīnah who persist in hypocrisy; you (O Muhammad) know them not, We know them. We shall punish them twice". (9:101). Since it was possible for the leader of mankind NOT to know some of the hypocrites even though they were with him in Madīnah for years, then it is more permissible for the Muslim 'ulamā after him, peace be upon him, NOT to know the true status of many of the apostate hypocrites (among his Sahābah).[365]

---

[365] Abū 'Abd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Dhahabī, Siyar Alam al-Nubalā, vol. 14, p. 343

كما كان جماعة في أيام النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم منتسبون إلى صحبته وإلى ملته، وهم في الباطن من مردة المنافقين، قد لا يعرفهم نبي الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، ولا يعلم بهم، قال الله تعالى: {وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ مَرَدُواْ عَلَى النِّفَاقِ لاَ تَعْلَمُهُمْ نَحْنُ نَعْلَمُهُمْ سَنُعَذِّبُهُم مَّرَّتَيْنِ} سورة التوبة 101 فإذا جاز على سيد البشر أن لا يعلم ببعض المنافقين وهم معه في المدينة سنوات، فبالأولى أن يخفى حال جماعة من المنافقين الفارغين عن دين الإسلام بعده عليه السلام على العلماء من أمته.

Fact is that they were not just "regarded as his Sahabah" as Dhahabi alludes but the noble Prophet counted them as his Sahabah. Another decisive verse reads:

Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah, and those with him are firm of heart against the unbelievers, compassionate among themselves; you will see them bowing down, prostrating themselves, seeking grace from Allah and pleasure; their marks are in their faces because of the effect of prostration; that is their description in the Taurat and their description in the Injeel; like as seed-produce that puts forth its sprout, then strengthens it, so it becomes stout and stands firmly on its stem, delighting the sowers that He may enrage the unbelievers on account of them;

Allah has promised those from among them who believe and do good, forgiveness and a great reward. [surah al-Fat'h: 29]

مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِم مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَٰلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَاةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيَغِيظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنْهُم مَّغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرًا عَظِيمًا

"Those with him (the Prophet)" were no doubt the Sahabah; however, Allah only promised "min-hum [from among them]" who truly believe and do good, the felicity. This also indicates that not all of "those with him" were righteous. The "min (من)" in both verses is for (التبعيض) with the meaning of "some (بعض)."

Imam Muslim documents a narration about a group of people who planned to assassinate the noble Prophet at Aqabah as he returns from the Tabuk where the battle with the Romans was meant to take place. Interestingly, these people were introduced as his sahabah.

Qais reported:

I said to Ammar: What is your opinion about that which you have done in case (of your siding with Hadrat Ali)? Is it your personal opinion or something you got from Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him)? Ammar said: We have got nothing from Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) which people at large did not get, but Hudhaifa told me that Allah's Apostle (peace be upon him) had especially told him amongst his sahabah, there were twelve Munafiqeen (hypocrites) out of whom eight would not get into Paradise, until a camel would be able to pass through the needle hole. The ulcer would be itself sufficient (to kill) eight. So far as four are concerned, I do not remember what Shu'ba said about them.[366]

في أصحابي اثنا عشر منافقا فهيم ثمانية لا يدخلون الجنة حتى ...
يلج الجمل في سم الخياط ثمانية منهم تكفيكهم الدبيلة وأربعة.

Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) also foretold the fate of some sahabah after him. Imam Muslim again documents:

---

[366] Sahih Muslim 2779 a; In-book reference : Book 51, Hadith 12; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 38, Hadith 6688; https://sunnah.com/muslim/51/12

Anas b. Mālik: The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, "Some men from among those who kept me company will meet me at the Lake-Fount. I will see them, and they will be presented to me. Then, they will be forced away from me. I will say: 'O my Lord, my Ṣaḥābah! My Ṣaḥābah'. It will be said to me: 'You do not know what they INNOVATED after you.'[367]

وَحَدَّثَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ حَاتِمٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَفَّانُ بْنُ مُسْلِمٍ الصَّفَّارُ، حَدَّثَنَا وُهَيْبٌ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَبْدَ الْعَزِيزِ بْنَ صُهَيْبٍ، يُحَدِّثُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَنَسُ بْنُ مَالِكٍ، أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ : لَيَرِدَنَّ عَلَيَّ الْحَوْضَ رِجَالٌ مِمَّنْ صَاحَبَنِي حَتَّى إِذَا رَأَيْتُهُمْ وَرُفِعُوا إِلَيَّ اخْتُلِجُوا دُونِي فَلأَقُولَنَّ أَىْ رَبِّ أُصَيْحَابِي أُصَيْحَابِي . فَلَيُقَالَنَّ لِي إِنَّكَ لاَ تَدْرِي مَا أَحْدَثُوا بَعْدَكَ

Thus, according to Allah and His Messenger, the precise definition of sahabah was "all of those who kept the company of the Prophet," and they were grouped into:

- The true believers
- The Munafiqeen [hypocrites]
- The innovators who changed after the demise of the Prophet.

This is exactly the belief of the Shi'a concerning the sahabah of the noble Prophet.

THE APOSTATES

The Professor mockingly introduced the Shi'i belief about the Sahabah thus:

It is part of the Shi'ite doctrine that all the companions of the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi sallam apostated after his life time but they exclude very few.

---

[367] Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muḥammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 4, p. 1800, # 2304 (40) https://sunnah.com/muslim/43/56

At an appropriate section, we shall look into Shi'a ahadith on the sahabah. Meanwhile, concerning apostated Sahabah which Qur'an (sura Aali Imran: 144) has implicitly predicted, following are few ahadith:

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

- Narrated Ibn Al-Musaiyab:

The sahabah of the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "Some men from my sahabah will come to my Lake-Fount and they will be driven away from it, and I will say, 'O Lord, my sahabah! It will be said, 'You have no knowledge of what they innovated after you left: they turned apostate as renegades (reverted from Islam).[368]

حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ صَالِحٍ، حَدَّثَنَا ابْنُ وَهْبٍ، قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي يُونُسُ، عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ، أَنَّهُ كَانَ يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ أَصْحَابِ النَّبِيِّ، صلى الله عليه وسلم أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ يَرِدُ عَلَى الْحَوْضِ رِجَالٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِي فَيُحَلَّئُونَ عَنْهُ فَأَقُولُ يَا رَبِّ أَصْحَابِي. فَيَقُولُ إِنَّكَ لاَ عِلْمَ لَكَ بِمَا أَحْدَثُوا بَعْدَكَ، إِنَّهُمُ ارْتَدُّوا عَلَى أَدْبَارِهِمُ الْقَهْقَرَى

- Narrated Abu Hazim from Sahl bin Sa`d:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "I am your predecessor (forerunner) at the Lake-Fount, and whoever will pass by there, he will drink from it and whoever will drink from it, he will never be thirsty. There will come to me some people whom I will recognize, and they will recognize me, but a barrier will be placed between me and them.[369]

---

[368] Sahih al-Bukhari 6586; In-book reference : Book 81, Hadith 174; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 8, Book 76, Hadith 586; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/81/174

[369] Sahih al-Bukhari 6583; In-book reference : Book 81, Hadith 171; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 8, Book 76, Hadith 585; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/81/171

حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ أَبِي مَرْيَمَ، حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ مُطَرِّفٍ، حَدَّثَنِي أَبُو حَازِمٍ، عَنْ سَهْلِ بْنِ سَعْدٍ، قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم إِنِّي فَرَطُكُمْ عَلَى الْحَوْضِ، مَنْ مَرَّ عَلَيَّ شَرِبَ، وَمَنْ شَرِبَ لَمْ يَظْمَأْ أَبَدًا، لَيَرِدَنَّ عَلَيَّ أَقْوَامٌ أَعْرِفُهُمْ وَيَعْرِفُونِي، ثُمَّ يُحَالُ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنَهُمْ.

- Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "While I was sleeping, a group, and when I recognized them, a man came out from amongst (us) me and them, he said (to them), 'Come along.' I asked, 'Where?' He said, "To the (Hell) Fire, by Allah! I asked, 'what is wrong with them?' He said, 'They turned apostate as renegades after you left.' Then behold! (Another) group were brought close to me, and when I recognized them, a man (an angel) came out from (me and them) he said (to them); Come along. I asked, "Where?" He said, 'To the (Hell) Fire, by Allah.' I asked, what is wrong with them? He said, 'They turned apostate as renegades after you left. So I did not see anyone of them escaping except a few who were like camels without a shepherd.[370]

حَدَّثَنِي إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ الْمُنْذِرِ، حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ فُلَيْحٍ، حَدَّثَنَا أَبِي قَالَ، حَدَّثَنِي هِلاَلٌ، عَنْ عَطَاءِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ، عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ، عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ بَيْنَا أَنَا قَائِمٌ إِذَا زُمْرَةٌ، حَتَّى إِذَا عَرَفْتُهُمْ خَرَجَ رَجُلٌ مِنْ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنِهِمْ فَقَالَ هَلُمَّ. فَقُلْتُ أَيْنَ قَالَ إِلَى النَّارِ وَاللَّهِ. قُلْتُ وَمَا شَأْنُهُمْ قَالَ إِنَّهُمُ ارْتَدُّوا بَعْدَكَ عَلَى أَدْبَارِهِمُ الْقَهْقَرَى. ثُمَّ إِذَا زُمْرَةٌ حَتَّى إِذَا عَرَفْتُهُمْ خَرَجَ رَجُلٌ مِنْ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنِهِمْ فَقَالَ هَلُمَّ. قُلْتُ أَيْنَ قَالَ إِلَى

---

[370] Sahih al-Bukhari 6587; In-book reference : Book 81, Hadith 175; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 8, Book 76, Hadith 587; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/81/175

النَّارِ وَاللَّهِ. قُلْتُ مَا شَأْنُهُمْ قَالَ إِنَّهُمُ ارْتَدُّوا بَعْدَكَ عَلَى أَدْبَارِهِمُ الْقَهْقَرَى. فَلاَ أُرَاهُ يَخْلُصُ مِنْهُمْ إِلاَّ مِثْلُ هَمَلِ النَّعَمِ

These were notable sahabah whom the Prophet recognised but they turned apostates after the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) left them, and on the day of judgment, as they will come in groups, only a few will escape hell-fire. Wait a minute! These are Ahlu Sunnah ahadith?! So, what is the hullabaloo that "Shi'a doctrine" says "some" sahabah turned apostates and only few were saved after the demise of the Prophet?

MEANING OF "APOSTASY"

Following the Shari'i meaning of "I'rtad [apostasy]," the Professor writes:

If one apostate he has to change from a Religion to another. If the companions apostatized, from which Religion have they changed? Is it from the Religion of Shi'ite? Were they initially Shi'ite and apostate to Sunni? If the Religion of Shi'ism was not in existence during their time, then from what Religion do they apostate? But if you claim that they change from Islam, what then was the new Religion they embrace?

Going by the context of the Ahlu Sunnah ahadith, the "apostasy" here does not necessarily mean "to change from one religion to another religion." Rather it is in the meaning of abandoning the instructions of Allah and His Messenger's Sunnah; and then practices something to the contrary. To establish this fact, the case of Malik ibn Nuwayrah[371] , a sahabi of the Prophet, and his people will be introduced.

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated-Abu'Huraira:

When Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) died and Abu Bakr became the caliph some Arabs renegade (reverted to disbelief) (Abu Bakr decided to declare war against them), `Umar, said to Abu Bakr, "How can you fight with these people although Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) said, 'I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight the people till they say: "None has the right to be worshipped but Allah, and whoever said it then he will save his life and property from me except on trespassing the law (rights and conditions for which he will be punished justly), and his accounts will be with Allah. " Abu

---

[371] Ibn Umar Yusuf Ibn Abdillah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Barr, *al-Isti'ab fi Marifat Sahabah*, (Beirut: Dar al-Jil, 1st Edition, 1412) [annotator: Ali Muhammad Al-Bajawi] vol.3, pg. 1362, #2303

Bakr said, "By Allah! I will fight those who differentiate between the prayer and the Zakat as Zakat is the compulsory right to be taken from the property (according to Allah's orders).

By Allah! If they refuse to pay me even a she-kid which they used to pay at the time of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him). I would fight with them for withholding it" Then `Umar said, "By Allah, it was nothing, but Allah opened Abu Bakr's chest towards the decision (to fight) and I came to know that his decision was right."[372]

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْيَمَانِ الْحَكَمُ بْنُ نَافِعٍ، أَخْبَرَنَا شُعَيْبُ بْنُ أَبِي حَمْزَةَ، عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ، حَدَّثَنَا عُبَيْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عُتْبَةَ بْنِ مَسْعُودٍ، أَنَّ أَبَا هُرَيْرَةَ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ قَالَ لَمَّا تُوُفِّيَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَكَانَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ وَكَفَرَ مَنْ كَفَرَ مِنَ الْعَرَبِ فَقَالَ عُمَرُ ـ رضى الله عنه كَيْفَ تُقَاتِلُ النَّاسَ، وَقَدْ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أُقَاتِلَ النَّاسَ حَتَّى يَقُولُوا لاَ إِلَهَ إِلاَّ اللَّهُ. فَمَنْ قَالَهَا فَقَدْ عَصَمَ مِنِّي مَالَهُ وَنَفْسَهُ إِلاَّ بِحَقِّهِ، وَحِسَابُهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ . فَقَالَ وَاللَّهِ لأُقَاتِلَنَّ مَنْ فَرَّقَ بَيْنَ الصَّلاَةِ وَالزَّكَاةِ، فَإِنَّ الزَّكَاةَ حَقُّ الْمَالِ، وَاللَّهِ لَوْ مَنَعُونِي عَنَاقًا كَانُوا يُؤَدُّونَهَا إِلَى رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لَقَاتَلْتُهُمْ عَلَى مَنْعِهَا. قَالَ عُمَرُ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ فَوَاللَّهِ مَا هُوَ إِلاَّ أَنْ قَدْ شَرَحَ اللَّهُ صَدْرَ أَبِي بَكْرٍ ـ رضى الله عنه ـ فَعَرَفْتُ أَنَّهُ الْحَقُّ

From this hadith, the "kufr (disbelief) and I'rtad (apostasy)" of this desert Arabs was their refusal to pay Zakat to the Caliph. Interestingly, Malik ibn Nuwayrah was his region's Zakat-collector of the Prophet during his blessed lifetime (peace be upon him and his progeny). So,

---

[372] Sahih al-Bukhari 1399, 1400; In-book reference: Book 24, Hadith 5; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 2, Book 24, Hadith 483 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/24/5

it is not that he abandoned Zakat as an obligatory act. He actually refused to pay the zakat to the new Caliph and he was declared Mur'tad and killed.

Imam Abdulrazaq documents:

Abdulrazaq – Mu'amar – al Zuhari –from- Abu Qutadah said:

During Ridda (apostasy war), we marched to Ahl Abyaat and reached there at sunset, then we raised our spears, hence they asked: 'Who are you?' We replied: 'We are slaves of Allah.' They said: 'We are slaves of Allah too.' Then Khalid arrested them and when it was morning, he ordered their beheading. Then I said: 'Oh Khalid! Fear Allah, this is not allowed for you.' He (Khalid) replied: 'Stay (back); this is not your business.' Then Abu Qutadah swore by Allah never to march with Khalid for any war. Qutadah said: 'The desert Arabs encouraged him (Khalid) on killing them for the sake of booties and that was Malik bin Nuwayrah's case.'[373]

أخبرنا عبد الرزاق عن معمر عن الزهري أن أبا قتادة قال : خرجنا في الردة حتى إذا انتهينا إلى أهل أبيات ، حتى طلعت الشمس للغروب ، فأرشفنا إليهم الرماح ، فقالوا : من أنتم ؟ قلنا : نحن عباد الله ، فقالوا : ونحن عباد الله ، فأسرهم خالد بن الوليد ، حتى إذا أصبح أمر أن يضرب أعناقهم ، قال أبو قتادة : فقلت : اتق الله يا خالد ! فإن هذا لا يحل لك ، قال : اجلس ، فإن هذا ليس منك في شئ قال : فكان أبو قتادة يحلف لا يغزو مع خالد أبدا ، قال : وكان الاعراب هم الذين شجعوه على قتلهم من أجل الغنائم. وكان ذلك في مالك بن نويرة

---

[373] Al-Musanaf (Beirut: Maktabah al-Islamiyyah, 1403, 2nd Edition) [annotator: Habib al-Rahman al-Azami] , Volume 10 page 174, #18722; http://islamport.com/d/1/mtn/1/115/4349.html

In short, according to Ahlu Sunnah ideological ahadith, a Muslim [a Sahabi] can become "mur'tad (apostate)" if he abandoned Allah's and His Messenger's commands.

SAHABAH AND THE WILAYAH OF ALI

It is a fact that the Shi'ah accused the Sahabah of "apostasy" when Majority of them abandoned the Wilayah [leadership] of Ali ibn Abi Talib as declared by the Prophet. Obviously, this "apostasy" never meant "renunciation of religion to another religion" as earlier stated.

The Professor writes:

It is part of the Shi'ite doctrine that all the companions of the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi sallam apostated after his life time but they exclude very few. Some are of the opinion of only three or four, the maximum opinion they have is thirteen companions, in these thirteen the in-laws of the Prophet, his wives and his other relatives were all not included.

What exactly is Shi'ah hadith says? Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni documents this hadith:

Abi Ja'far (alayhi salam) said: The people were the people of Ridda [apostasy] after the demise of the Prophet (salallahu alayhi wa ahlih) except three. I said: Who are the three? He said: al-Miqdad b. al-Aswad, Abu Dhar al-Ghiffari and Salman al-Farsi, may Allah's mercy and blessings be upon them, then the people came to realize after a short while. These (three) are those around whom the banner (of truth) revolved and they refused to give Bay`a (to Abu Bakr), until when they brought the Commander of the Faithful (alayhi salam) under coercion and he gave the pledge of allegiance. That is (the interpretation of) His words the Elevated: "Muhammad is not but a messenger, messengers have come and gone before him, if he dies or is killed, will you turn back on your heels?! And whoever turns back on his heels then he will not harm Allah a thing and Allah will recompense those who are grateful" (3:144).[374]

حنان، عن أبيه، أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال: كان الناس أهل ردة بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وآله إلا ثلاثة. فقلت: ومن الثلاثة؟ فقال: المقداد بن الأسود، وأبو ذر الغفاري، وسلمان الفارسي، رحمة الله وبركاته عليهم، ثم عرف الناس بعد يسير. وقال: هؤلاء الذين دارت عليهم

---

[374] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *Rawdah al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition): Vol. 8 Pg. 133, hadith No. 341

الرحا وأبوا أن يبايعوا، حتى جاؤوا بأمير المؤمنين مكرَ هاً فبايع، وذلك قوله تعالى: (وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهِ ٱلرُّسُلُ أَفَإِي۟ن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ ٱنقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَىٰٓ أَعْقَـٰبِكُمْ وَمَن يَنقَلِبْ عَلَىٰ عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَن يَضُرَّ ٱللَّهَ شَيْـًٔا وَسَيَجْزِى ٱللَّهُ ٱلشَّـٰكِرِينَ)

Following are deducted from this Shi'ah hadith:

- People "renounced" their witness of Ali's wilayah after the demise of the Prophet; hence, they were said to be "apostates"
- Only "three" of the sahabah did not flinch; that is, they refused to give Bay'a until they were coerced
- After a while, majority of people realized their faults

Therefore, in general, the same Imam Jafar as-Sadiq (peace be upon him) gives us the state of the true Sahabah. Sheikh Mirza al-Nuri reports:

It is recorded in al-Khiṣāl with the ṣaḥīḥ chain that Abū 'Abd Allāh (Imām al-Ṣādiq), peace be upon him, said:

"The Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet, peace be upon him and his family, were twelve thousand. Eight thousand were from al-Madīnah and two thousand were from Makkah, and (another) two thousand were from the al-Ṭulaqā (i.e. those who accepted Islām on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah). There were no Qadariyyah, or Murjiah, or Ḥarūriyyah, or Mu'tazilah or heretics among them. They used to weep day and night, and used to say: "(O Allah!) Take away our souls before we eat barley bread."[375]

---

[375] Mirza al-Nuri, *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, vol. 1, p. 212; http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/

Those were just few righteous sahabah living in Makkah and Madinah, not to mention others in other cities of Arabia, Syria, Iraq.

Furthermore, Shaykh al-Kulayni (may Allah be pleased with him) also records:

Abū 'Alī al-Ash'arī – Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Jabbār and Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl – al-Faḍl b. Shadhān – Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā – 'Abd al-Raḥman b. al-Ḥajjāj:

Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā (al-Kāẓim), peace be upon him, sent to me the will of Amīr al-Mūminīn ('Alī b. Abī Ṭālib), peace be upon him, and this is its text:

In the Name of Allāh, the Most Beneficent, the Most Merciful... I command you, O Ḥasan, and the entirety of my family and all my descendants, and whosoever my document reaches, to fear Allāh your Lord, and do not die except as Muslims. And hold fast to the Rope of Allāh, all of you together, and do not be divided ... I remind you of Allāh, I remind you of Allah, concerning the descendants of your Prophet. They must not be oppressed while you are present and you are capable of defending them. I remind you of Allāh, I remind you of Allāh concerning the Sahabah of your Prophet, those who have not invented any innovation, and who have not helped any innovator, for verily the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family, gave commands concerning them and cursed the innovators among them and among others too, and also cursed the helpers of the'innovators.[376]

---

[376] Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ya'qub ibn Ishaq al-Kulayni, *al-Kāfī*, vol. 7, pp. 49-52, # 6 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/

Imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal also documented this ḥadīth about innovators:

'Abd Allāh – my father – Yaḥyā – Sa'īd b. Abī 'Arūbah – Qatādah – al-Ḥasan – Qays b. 'Abbād:

About this ḥadīth, Shaykh Hādī al-Najafī states: "The report has a sahih chain."[377]

Indeed, Shi'ah accord maximum respect to all the righteous Sahabah and constantly pray for them. However, we have nothing to do with the innovators and apostates from amongst them.

THE SAHABAH SUCCESS STORIES

Question 45:

What shall be your response to a man who challenges the practicability of Islam, claiming that the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, failed to have those who would be firm in practicing the religion during their lifetime? Since Islam wasn't practicable during his time, how on earth can the present or future generations practice it?

I went, along with al-Ashtar, to 'Alī, may Allāh be pleased with him, and we said: "Did the Prophet of Allāh, peace be upon him, tell you anything which he did not tell other people?" He said: "No, except what is in this document of mine: '... **Whosoever invents an innovation or helps an innovator, upon him is the Curse of Allāh, the angels, and all mankind altogether.**'"

Shaykh Shu'ayb al-Arnaūṭ comments: "Its chain is ṣaḥīḥ upon the standard of the two Shaykhs."

Source: Abu Abdullah Ahmad ibn Hanbal al-Shaybani, Musnad, vol. 1, p. 122, # 993 http://islamport.com/d/1/mtn/1/89/3410.html?zoom_highlightsub=%E6%E3%CA%E4

[377] Hādī al-Najafī, *Mawsū'at Aḥādīth Ahl al-Bayt*, vol. 11, p. 19, # 13406

Remember! These are the ones whom Allah praised for their actions, who He cured of any dirt of evil. He proclaimed His trust in them in His Glorious Book. If they are found wanting, whom on earth could be firm?

THE REPLY

Obviously, this question came out of the assumption that all the sahabah of the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) with no exception were pious and righteous. Now that it has been proven beyond any shadow of doubt that there were Munafiqeen (hypocrites), innovators and apostates from amongst them, then, there is no point entertaining this kind of generalised question.

Allah praises the true believers from amongst the sahabah with their distinctive feature of goodness when He says [al-Tawbah, verse 100]:

And (as for) the foremost, the first of the Muhajirs and the Ansars, and those who followed them in goodness, Allah is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, to abide in them for ever; that is the mighty achievement.

وَالسَّابِقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُم بِإِحْسَانٍ رَّضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتَهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

Those were whom Allah's pleasure is upon. They were the success story of the noble Prophet and Islam. They were people of Sunnah. In fact, their presence, righteous lifestyle and God-fearing vigilant eyes checkmated the evil and innovations of the innovators and hypocrites from amongst them after the demise of the noble Prophet. Here we cite just three examples out of hundreds.

Imam Malik Ibn Anas documents:

Yahya related to me from Malik from Zayd ibn Aslam from Ata ibn Yasar that Muawiya ibn Abi Sufyan sold a

gold or silver drinking- vessel for more than its weight. Abu adDarda said, "I heard the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, forbidding such sales except like for like." Muawiya said to him, "I don't see any harm in it." Abu ad-Darda said to him, "Who will excuse me from Muawiya? I tell him something from the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and he gives me his own opinion! I will not live in the same land as you!" Then Abu ad-Darda went to Umar ibn al-Khattab and mentioned that to him. Umar ibn al-Khattab therefore wrote to Muawiya, "Do not sell it except like for like, weight for weight."[378]

وَحَدَّثَنِي عَنْ مَالِكٍ، عَنْ زَيْدِ بْنِ أَسْلَمَ، عَنْ عَطَاءِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ، أَنَّ مُعَاوِيَةَ بْنَ أَبِي سُفْيَانَ، بَاعَ سِقَايَةً مِنْ ذَهَبٍ أَوْ وَرِقٍ بِأَكْثَرَ مِنْ وَزْنِهَا فَقَالَ أَبُو الدَّرْدَاءِ سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلي الله عليه وسلم يَنْهَى عَنْ مِثْلِ هَذَا إِلاَّ مِثْلاً بِمِثْلٍ فَقَالَ لَهُ مُعَاوِيَةُ مَا أَرَى بِمِثْلِ هَذَا بَأْسًا فَقَالَ أَبُو الدَّرْدَاءِ مَنْ يَعْذِرُنِي مِنْ مُعَاوِيَةَ أَنَا أُخْبِرُهُ عَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلي الله عليه وسلم وَيُخْبِرُنِي عَنْ رَأْيِهِ لاَ أُسَاكِنُكَ بِأَرْضٍ أَنْتَ بِهَا ثُمَّ قَدِمَ أَبُو الدَّرْدَاءِ عَلَى عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ فَذَكَرَ ذَلِكَ لَهُ فَكَتَبَ عُمَرُ بْنُ الْخَطَّابِ إِلَى مُعَاوِيَةَ أَنْ لاَ تَبِيعَ ذَلِكَ إِلاَّ مِثْلاً بِمِثْلٍ وَزْنًا بِوَزْنٍ

Sheikh Nasir Din Al-Albani also records:

Narrated Sa'īd b. Jubayr: I was with Ibn 'Abbās at 'Arafāt. He then said, "What happened? I do not hear people saying Labayk Allāhuma labayk?" I said, "They fear Mu'āwiyah." As a result, Ibn 'Abbās came out of his large

---

[378] Malik ibn Anas, *Al-Muwatta*; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 31, Hadith 33Arabic reference: Book 31, Hadith 1324https://sunnah.com/urn/513230

tent and said, "Labayk Allāhuma labayk! Verily, they have forsaken the Sunnah due to hatred of 'Alī."[379]

عن سعيد بن جبير قال كنت مع ابن عباس بعرفات فقال ما لي لا أسمع الناس يلبون قلت يخافون من معاوية. فخرج ابن عباس من فسطاطه فقال لبيک اللّٰهُمَّ لبيک لبيک فإنهم قد تركوا السنة من بغض علي.

Albani comments: Its chain is sahīh

Imam Nasai documents another athar:

It was narrated that Al-Hakam said:

أَخْبَرَنَا إِسْحَاقُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ، قَالَ أَنْبَأَنَا أَبُو عَامِرٍ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ، عَنِ الْحَكَمِ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَلِيَّ بْنَ حُسَيْنٍ، يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ مَرْوَانَ، أَنَّ عُثْمَانَ، نَهَى عَنِ الْمُتْعَةِ، وَأَنْ يَجْمَعَ الرَّجُلُ بَيْنَ الْحَجِّ وَالْعُمْرَةِ فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ لَبَّيْكَ بِحَجَّةٍ وَعُمْرَةٍ مَعًا . فَقَالَ عُثْمَانُ أَتَفْعَلُهَا وَأَنَا أَنْهَى عَنْهَا فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ لَمْ أَكُنْ لأَدَعَ سُنَّةَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلي الله عليه وسلم لأَحَدٍ مِنَ النَّاسِ .

I heard Ali bin Husain narrating from Marwan, that Uthman FORBADE Mut'ah and joining Hajj and "Umrah. Ali said; Labbaika bi Hajjatin wa Umratin ma'an - Here I am, (O Allah) for Hajj and 'Umrah together'.

---

[379] Muhammad Nāsir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Sahīh Sunan Ibn Majah* (Riyadh: Maktab al-Tarbiyyah al-'Arabī li Dawl al-Khalīj; 1408), vol. 2, p. 343, #3006; Also, Sunan an-Nasa'I, hadith 3006; In-book refrence: Book 24, Hadith 389; English translation: vol. 3, Book 24, Hadith 3009; https://sunnah.com/nasai/24/389

Uthman said: Are you doing this when I have forbidden it? Ali said; I will not give up the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah for any of the people.[380]

These are few success stories of the struggles of the righteous sahabah in upholding the Sunnah of the Prophet. Had there not been for them, nothing would be left of Islam except innovations.

UGLY SCENE AT AL-HUDAYBIYYAH

Question 46:

The Shi'ites accuse the companions of disrespecting the Prophet's command and opinion during the Treaty of Hudaibiyyah. The Prophet had the opinion to embark on a treaty while none of them shared the same view; they all believed that they were correct and powerful. Even the Glorious Qur'an revealed to them the promise of entering Makkah peacefully and performing Umrah, a lesser pilgrimage, yet when they came, they were unable to enter Makkah at all. The Noble Prophet consented to the treaty, the terms of which were completely unfavorable to Muslims and Islam. Part of the terms stated that whoever from the Quraysh embraced Islam and came to Madinah, the Noble Prophet would return him to Makkah, while if one of his companions apostatized, he had no right against him and should allow him to return safely to Makkah.

The companions were never certain about the possibility of this treaty; they all believed that Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala, would send a revelation that would contradict the treaty. This was the motive when the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, instructed them to sacrifice their animals and remove their Ihram. They kept silent and sat waiting for divine intervention. Following the advice of his wife, the Prophet led by example, establishing the fact

---

[380] Sunan an-Nasa'i 2723; In-book reference: Book 24, Hadith 0; English translation: Vol. 3, Book 24, Hadith 2724; https://sunnah.com/urn/1078930

that this intending rite was necessary. They later obeyed him and did as he did. The Shi'ites interpret this action as amounting to apostasy by all of the companions.

Our question is: where was Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, during those days? Was he at home? Didn't he attend the treaty? Both our books and yours establish his presence; what happened then? Shouldn't he have obeyed the instructions so as not to be among the apostates?

Whatever your response regarding his reasons may be will apply equally to Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu, Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, and all of the companions.

THE REPLY

The first banter of the Professor is stated thus:

The Shi'ite accuse the companions of disrespecting Prophet's command and opinion during the treaty of hudaibiyyah, he has the opinion to embark on a treaty while none of them share same with him, they all believed that they are on the right opinion...

Before going further, we would like to quickly ask the following questions:

- Was the treaty of al-Hudaybiyyah a personal opinion of the Prophet?
- If it was Allah's command to his Messenger, then, why would the sahabah not share the same "opinion" with their commander-in-chief, the noble Prophet?

And things got messy when the Professor threw another bomb on the sahabah:

The companions were never certain for the possibility of this treaty; they all believed that Allah subhanahu wa ta'ala will make a revelation that will disconcur with the treaty, that was the motive when the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi Wasallam instructed them to sacrifice their animals

and remove their "Ihram" they kept silent and sat waiting for a divine intervention...

In other word, the sahabah did not like the "divine decision" of the Prophet. To say they were waiting for a revelation does not justify their "displeasure" to the decision of the Prophet; and their "keeping silent" to his instructions. So, is the Shi'ah not justified saying the sahabah disobeyed the commands of the Prophet? However, the Professor tried to score a polemic cheap point by saying, "The Shi'ite interprets this action as amounting to apostasy by all of the companions." The weight of this bogus claim is on his shoulder to prove in Shi'ah authentic book or define what is meant by "apostasy."

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir gives us detail of the Hudaybiyyah's treaty. He documents:

Ma`mar said that Az-Zuhri narrated, "When Suhayl bin `Amr came, he said to the Prophet , `Please conclude a peace treaty with us. So, the Prophet called `Ali bin Abi Talib and said to him, « اكْتُبْ بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمنِ الرَّحِيمِ » (Write: In the Name of Allah, Ar-Rahman, Ar-Rahim.) Suhayl bin `Amr said, `As for Ar-Rahman, by Allah, I do not know what it means. So write: By Your Name, O Allah, as you used to write previously. The Muslims said, `By Allah, we will not write except: By the Name of Allah, Ar-Rahman, Ar-Rahim. The Prophet said, « اكْتُبْ بِاسْمِكَ اللهُم » (Write: "In Your Name O Allah.") Then he dictated:

« هذَا مَا قَاضَى عَلَيْهِ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ الله » (This is a peace treaty, which Muhammad, Allah's Messenger has concluded.) Suhayl said, `By Allah, if we knew that you are Allah's Messenger, we would not prevent you from visiting the Ka`bah, and would not fight with you. So, write: Muhammad bin `Abdullah. The Prophet said to him, « وَاللهِ إِنِّي لَرَسُولُ اللهِ وَإِنْ كَذَّبْتُمُونِي، اكْتُبْ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الله » (By Allah! I am the Messenger of Allah even if your people do not believe me. Write: "Muhammad bin `Abdullah.")

Az-Zuhri continued, "The Prophet accepted all those things, since he had already said that he would accept everything they would demand if it respects the ordinance of Allah, the Exalted."

The Hadith continues, "The Prophet said to Suhayl, « عَلَى أَنْ تُخَلُّوا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَ الْبَيْتِ فَنَطُوفَ بِهِ » (On the condition that you allow us to visit the House so that we may perform Tawaf around it.) Suhayl said, `By Allah, we will not, so as not to give the Arabs a chance to say that we have yielded to your pressure, but we will allow you next year. So, the Prophet had that written. Then Suhayl said, `We also stipulate that you should return to us whoever comes to you from us, even if he embraced your religion.

The Muslims protested, `Glorified be Allah! How can a person be returned to the idolaters after he has become a Muslim. While they were in this state Abu Jandal bin Suhayl bin `Amr came from the valley of Makkah staggering with his chains and fell down among the Muslims. Suhayl said, `O Muhammad! This is the very first term with which we make peace with you, that is, you shall return Abu Jandal to me. The Prophet said, « إِنَّا لَمْ نَقْضِ الْكِتَابَ بَعْدُ » (The peace treaty has not been written yet.) Suhayl said, `Then by Allah, I will never conduct peace with you.' The Prophet said, « فَأَجِزْهُ لِي » (Release him to me,) and Suhayl responded, `I will never allow you to keep him.' The Prophet said, « بَلَى فَافْعَلْ »

(Yes, do.) He said, `I will not.' Mikraz said, `We allow you (to keep him).' Abu Jandal said, `O, Muslims! Will I be returned to the idolaters although I have come as a Muslim. Don't you see how much I have suffered?' Abu Jandal had been tortured severely for the cause of Allah, the Exalted and Most Honored. `Umar bin Al-Khattab said, `I went to the Prophet and said: Aren't you truly the Messenger of Allah'. The Prophet said, « بَلَى » (Yes, indeed.) I said, `Isn't our cause just and the cause of the enemy unjust?'

He said, « بَلَى » (Yes.) I said, `Then why should we be humble in our religion.' He said:

« إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللهِ وَلَسْتُ أَعْصِيهِ وَهُوَ نَاصِرِي » (I am Allah's Messenger and I do not disobey Him, and He will make me victorious.) I said, `Didn't you tell us that we would go to the Ka`bah and perform Tawaf around it.' He said, « بَلَى أَفَأَخْبَرْتُكَ أَنَّا نَأْتِيهِ الْعَامَ؟ » (Yes, but did I tell you that we would visit the Ka`bah this year) I said, `No.' He said, « فَإِنَّكَ آتِيهِ وَمُطَوِّفٌ بِهِ » (So you will visit it and perform Tawaf around it.) `Umar further said, `I went to Abu Bakr and said: O Abu Bakr! Isn't he truly Allah's Prophet.' He replied, `Yes.' I said, `Is not our cause just and the cause of our enemy unjust.' He said, `Yes.' I said, `Then why should we be humble in our religion.' He said, `O you man! Indeed, he is Allah's Messenger and he does not disobey his Lord, and He will make him victorious. Adhere to him for, by Allah, he is on the right path.' I said, `Was he not telling us that we would go to the Ka`bah and perform Tawaf around it.' He said, `Yes, but did he tell you that you would go to the Ka`bah this year.' I said, `No.' He said, `You will go to the Ka`bah and perform Tawaf around it.'

Az-Zuhri said, "`Umar (may Allah be pleased with him) said, `I performed many good deeds as expiation for the improper questions I asked them.' "When the writing of the peace treaty was concluded, Allah's Messenger said to his Companions, « قُومُوا فَانْحَرُوا ثُمَّ احْلِقُوا » (Get up and slaughter your sacrifices and have your heads shaved.) By Allah none of them got up, and the Prophet repeated his order thrice. When none of them got up, he left them and went to Umm Salamah and told her of the people's attitudes towards him. Umm Salamah said, `O Prophet of Allah! Do you want your order to be carried out? Go out and don't say a word to anybody until you have slaughtered your sacrifice and call your barber to shave your head.' The Messenger of Allah went out and did not talk to anyone until he did what she suggested, slaughtered the sacrifice and shaved his head. Seeing that, the

Companions got up, slaughtered their sacrifices, and started shaving the heads of one another. There was so much of a rush -- and sadness -- that there was a danger of killing each other..."[381]

It is crystal clear from this story that the noble Prophet was acting under the order of his Lord. His reply to Umar's improper questions was, "I am Allah's Messenger and I do not disobey Him." Therefore, the sahabah were very much aware [at least at that point of his reply to Umar] that the Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny)'s decisions [no matter how displeased it is to them] were instructions from his Lord.

So, what excuse do they have not to obey the Prophet's orders? Even Umar ibn al-Khattab confessed "I performed many good deeds as expiation for the improper questions I asked them" and the worse of his questions is stated further in his own very confession:

'Umar said, "I swear by Allāh, I never DOUBTED since I accepted Islām UNTIL THAT DAY (i.e. Day of Hudaybiyyah). I went to the Prophet, peace be upon him and said, "Are you NOT the Messenger of Allāh IN TRUTH?"[382]

---

[381] Isma'il ibn Umar ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-*Azeem (Saudi Arabia: Dar Taybah Li-Nashr wa al-Tawzih) [annotator: Sami ibn Muhammad al-Salamah]; Surah al-Fat'h, section: [The hadith that tells the story of al-Hudaybiyyah and the peace treaty that followed], vol. 7, Page 352
http://m.qtafsir.com/Surah-Al-Fath/The-Hadiths-that-tell-the-Stor---

Also, see sahih al-Bukhari hadith 2731, 2732. https://sunnah.com/bukhari/54/19

[382] Ibn Hibbān, *Sahīh* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risālah;2nd edition, 1414 H) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt], vol. 11, p. 216, # 4872

فقال عمر بن الخطاب رضوان الله عليه: والله ما شككت منذ أسلمت إلا يومئذ فأتيت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقلت : ألست رسول الله حقا؟

حديث صحيح

Sheikh al-Ar'naut comments: Authentic hadith

This is an ugly scene which should not be often remembered. Trying to deny or defend the disobedient actions of some Sahabah is denying reality itself. Some will even argue that Allah was pleased with the sahabah at Hudaybiyyah due to their pledge to the Prophet. However, when we put the whole story together, one will realize that the sahabah had already [before their lacklustre attitudes] pledged allegiance to the Prophet under the tree before their disobedience. Allah says:

"Certainly, Allah was well pleased with the believers when they swore allegiance to you under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity on them and rewarded them with a near victory."[383]

لَّقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا

Imam Muslim documents the purpose of this pledge:

It has been narrated on the authority of Ma'qil b. Yasar who said:

I remember being present on the Day of the Tree, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) was taking the oath of the people and I was holding a twig of the tree over his head. We were fourteen hundred (in number). We did not take

[383] Surah al-Fat'h: 18

oath to the death, but to the effect that we would not run away from the battlefield.[384]

وَحَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ يَحْيَى، أَخْبَرَنَا يَزِيدُ بْنُ زُرَيْعٍ، عَنْ خَالِدٍ، عَنِ الْحَكَمِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، بْنِ الأَعْرَجِ عَنْ مَعْقِلِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ، قَالَ لَقَدْ رَأَيْتُنِي يَوْمَ الشَّجَرَةِ وَالنَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُبَايِعُ النَّاسَ وَأَنَا رَافِعٌ غُصْنًا مِنْ أَغْصَانِهَا عَنْ رَأْسِهِ وَنَحْنُ أَرْبَعَ عَشْرَةَ مِائَةً قَالَ لَمْ نُبَايِعْهُ عَلَى الْمَوْتِ وَلَكِنْ بَايَعْنَاهُ عَلَى أَنْ لاَ نَفِرَّ

This pledge was so important that there was a possibility a war could break out between the Muslims and the Kuffar due to the rumor that Prophet's representative to the Quraysh [Uthman ibn Affan] had been murdered. And indeed, they need to take oath before Allah and His Messenger as large majority of them [including Umar and Uthman] ran away from previous battlefield [of Uhud] leaving the Prophet for dead.[385] Yet, Allah warned them again:

Surely those who swear allegiance to you do but swear allegiance to Allah; the hand of Allah is above their hands. Therefore, whoever breaks (his faith), he breaks it only to the injury of his own soul[386] , and whoever fulfills what he has covenanted with Allah, He will grant him a mighty reward.[387]

---

[384] Sahih Muslim 1858 a; In-book reference: Book 33, Hadith 114; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 20, Hadith 4586; https://sunnah.com/muslim/33/114

[385] See *Tafsir al-Tabari* on Surah Aal-Imran: 153 [When you ran off precipitately and did not wait for anyone, and the Messenger was calling you from the rear...]

[386] And indeed, many of them broke their allegiance to Allah afterwards: at the battles of Khandaq, Khaybar and Hunayn.

[387] Surah al-Fat'h: 10

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يُبَايِعُونَكَ إِنَّمَا يُبَايِعُونَ اللَّهَ يَدُ اللَّهِ فَوْقَ أَيْدِيهِمْ فَمَن نَّكَثَ فَإِنَّمَا يَنكُثُ عَلَىٰ نَفْسِهِ وَمَنْ أَوْفَىٰ بِمَا عَاهَدَ عَلَيْهُ اللَّهَ فَسَيُؤْتِيهِ أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا

Finally, the Professor played his last card as he tried to use Ali ibn Abi Talib as a defensive shield for the sinful acts of the sahabah. What a world!

Our professor writes:

Our question is: on those days where was Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu? Or was he at home didn't he attend the treaty? Both our Books & yours establish his presence, what happened then? He should have obeyed instructions alone for him not to be among the apostates?

Whatever shall be your response for his reason(s), will be the same for Abubakar Radiyallahu Anhu, Umar Radiyallahu Anhu, Uthman Radiyallahu Anhu and the whole of the companions.

We reply this question using the very reply of the Prophet to some sahabah who came to him complaining about Ali. He (peace be upon him and his progeny) says to them:

"What do you want from Ali?! What do you want from Ali?! Indeed, Ali is from me, and I am from him, and he is the Wali of every believer after me."[388]

Apart from the fact that Ali never ever ran away from the battlefield [since his allegiance is to lay his life in defending his master, Muhammad], and the fact that he never disobeyed the order of the Prophet, he was naturally not being counted as part of "the sahabah." Ali is of the Prophet's ahl al-Bayt (household), and none of his ahl al-Bayt will ever preceed him in any action. This is the general

---

[388] Jami' sahih al-Tirmidhi: English reference : Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3712; Arabic reference : Book 49, Hadith 4077; https://sunnah.com/urn/735910

perception of the Sahabah themselves. For example, a man asked Abdullah ibn Umar about 'Ali and Uthman.

Imam Nasai gives the report:

Hilal ibn al-Ala ibn Hilli narrated from Husayn (ibn Ayyash) from Zuhayr (ibn Muawiya) from Abu Is'haq that al-Ala ibn Erar said:

Once I asked Abdullah ibn Umar 'Would you talk to me about Ali and Uthman?' He said 'As for Ali, this is his house (close position) of the messenger of Allah (as)'s household and I do not need to talk to you about anything else. But as for Uthman, on the Day of Uhud, he committed a great sin and Allah forgave him and then he committed among you a small sin and you killed him.[389]

أخبرني هلال بن العلاء بن هلال قال حدثنا حسين قال حدثنا زهير عن أبي إسحاق عن العلاء بن عرار قال سألت عبد الله بن عمر قلت ألا تحدثني عن علي وعثمان قال أما علي فهذا بيته من بيت رسول الله ولا أحدثك عنه بغيره وأما عثمان فإنه أذنب يوم أحد ذنبا عظيما فعفى الله عنه وأذنب فيكم ذنبا صغيرا

ALI AND THE OATH BREAKERS [TALHA AND ZUBAYR]

Question 47:

You always accuse Zubair bin Awwam of fighting Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, during the Battle of the Camel, claiming that it was because he hates Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu.

---

[389] Sunan al-Kubra [Muasasah ar-Risalah, Beirut, Lebanon] (Footnote: Dr. Abdullah ibn Abdul Muhsin At-Turki), part 7, page 446, hadith No. 8436 http://islamport.com/w/mtn/Web/1231/2265.htm

It seems you have forgotten, or perhaps do not remember, that when the Shurah committee was set up by Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, from which the new leader would emerge, Zubair was the first to step down in favor of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu. Talha, Radiyallahu Anhu, stepped down for Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, while Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas stepped down in favor of Abdurrahman bin Auf. If Zubair, Radiyallahu Anhu, hates Ali, why would he step down in his favor?

THE REPLY

For a fact, the Shi'ah did not accuse Talhah and Zubayr of hating Ali ibn Abi Talib. It is very obvious that our professor is either ignorant of the Shi'ah position on them or only choose to fabricate a lie against the Shi'ah.

Hazrat Talhah and Zubayr stood by Ali ibn Abi Talib from day one [when Abu Bakr assumed office] and they tried to win his mandate back at the six-man Shura committee which failed. Furthermore, when Ali ibn Abi Talib finally assumed the seat of the authority, they were the first to pledge allegiance to him. However, their allegiance was short-lived as they broke it and turned against Ali ibn Abi Talib in the first civil war – battle of Jamal [Camel].

Hafiz ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani writes:

"His statement {It is firmly established that the people of al-Jamal (under 'Āishah), and Siffīn (under Mu'āwiyah) and al-Nahrawān (i.e. the Khawārij) were rebels} is true. What further proves this is the hadīth of 'Alī in which he says "I was COMMANDED [by the Prophet] to fight the oath-breakers, the Qāsitīn and the apostates". Al-Nisāī recorded it in al-Khasāis, as well as al-Bazzār and al-Tabarānī. The people of al-Jamal (under 'Āishah) were the oath-breakers because they broke their bay'ah to him (i.e. 'Alī), and the Qāsitīn were the people of Syria (under Mu'āwiyah) because they left the haqq (truth) in their refusal to give him bay'ah. The apostates were the people of al-Nahrawān (i.e. the Khawārij) due to the establishment of the sahīh report about them that "they apostasized from the religion as the arrow leaves the bow

(i.e. completely)". The hadīth that 'Ammār would be killed by a rebellious group is also established about the Syrians (i.e. they murdered him)."[390]

The great Shi'ah sheikh Abu Abdillah Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Numan popularly known as Sheikh Mufid documents:

Abul Hasan Ali b. Khalid al-Maraghi reported to me from Abul Qasim al-Hasan b. Ali al-Kufi, who reported from Ja'far b. Muhammad b. Marwan, who reported from his father, who reported from Ishaq b. Yazid, who reported from Sulayman b. Qaram, from Abu al-Jahhaf, from Ammar al-Duhni, who reported from Abu Uthman, the Muazzin of Banu Afsa that he heard Ali ibn Abi Talib say when Talha and al-Zubair advanced to fight him:

"What excuse can Talha and al-Zubair have! They swore allegiance to me of their own accord, without any coercion and they broke off without any event." Then he (Ali) recited the verse: "And if they break their oaths after their treaty and revile your religion, then fight the leaders of unbelief, for their oaths are worthless, so that you may restrain them." [al-Tawbah: 12].[391]

Interestingly, according to the historical fact of Ahlu Sunnah, just before the battle of Jamal started, Ali ibn Abi Talib reminded Zubayr of the Prophet's prophecy which made him scared. Imam Jarir al-Tabari gives us a detailed account of the battle:

According to Abu Ja'far: Others have given accounts of this battle and of al-Zubayr and how he left his post that day, which differ from Sayf's account from his two informants. Some of them gave the account of that which Ahmad b. Zuhayr (-his father Abu Khaythamah-Wahb b. Jarir b. Hazim-his father Yunus b. Yazid al-Ayli-al-Zuhri)

---

[390] Refer to chapter 31.

[391] Abu Abdillah Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Nu'man, *Al-Amaali* [The Dictations of Sheikh al-Mufid] (London: The world Federation of Khoja Shia Ithna-Asheri; 1st Edition, 1998), Eight Assembly, hadith No. 7, page 87

told me in an account of the story of `Ali, Talhah and al-Zubayr, and `A'ishah, which we are in the process of relating: The news, that is, of the seventy who were killed with al-`Abdi at al-Basrah, reached `Ali, so he advanced with 12,000men and came to al-Basrah and said:

When the [forces] confronted each other `Ali went out on his horse and called out to al-Zubayr, and the two of them confronted each other. `Ali asked al-Zubayr, "What has brought you [to this]?" "You," he replied. "I don't find you suitable for this leadership or more entitled to it than we."

"After `Uthman,"replied `Ali, "it is certainly not you who are suitable for it. We considered you one of Banu `Abd al-Muttalib until your son, the son of evil, reached maturity and created a division between us and you." `Ali then said how bad the evil he had done was and mentioned how the Prophet had passed by the two of them and had said to `Ali: "What did the son of your father's sister say? He will fight you, being the aggressor." Al-Zubayr then left him, saying, "I will not fight you." He returned to his son `Abdallah and said, "I have no firm conviction about this war." "When you set out you did have," replied his son, "but you saw the banners of Ibn Abi Talib and you realized that that meant death, so you lost heart." These words angered him so that he shook with rage and said angrily:

"Woe betide you! I have sworn him an oath not to fight him." "Expiate your oath by freeing your ghulam Sarjis," his son replied. So, he freed him, and he joined the ranks alongside them. `Ali had said to al-Zubayr: "Are you asking me for compensation for the blood of `Uthman, when it was you who killed him? I ask Allah in His power right now to give a hateful punishment to he among us who was the severest in opposing `Uthman." `Ali said to Talhah: "You have brought the Messenger of Allah's wife to make her fight while you hide your wife at home. Didn't you give me allegiance?" "I did," he replied, "but with the sword at my neck."

`Ali then said to those around him: "Which of you will hold up this copy of the Qur'an and what is in it before

them? Should his hand be cut off, he will then take it with his other one; if that is cut off, he will take it with his teeth."

A young boy said, "I will." `Ali put this to everyone around him, but none volunteered except the boy, so `Ali said to him, "Hold this up before them and say, 'Every word in this shall judge between you and us, and I beg of you for Allah's sake to stop shedding our blood and yours.'" But, with the copy of the Qur'an in his hand, the boy was attacked. His hands were cut off, so he took it in his teeth until he was killed. `Ali then said, "Battle is now justified, so fight them!"

Seventy men were killed that day, each holding in turn the nose rein of `A'ishah's camel. After the camel was hamstrung and the force was routed, an arrow hit Talhah and killed him. Some say that it was fired by Marwan b. al-Hakam. At one stage Ibn al-Zubayr had taken hold of the camel's nose rein and `A'ishah had said, "Who is this?" When he told her she said, "Weep for the bereavement of Asma'!" Indeed, he did get wounded and threw himself down among the other wounded and was pulled out and recovered from his wound.

Muhammad b. Abi Bakr carried `A'ishah away and erected a large tent over her. `Ali came and stood in front of her and said: "You roused the people, and they became excited. You stirred up discord among them such that some killed others," and he went on at length. `A'ishah replied: "Ibn Abi Talib! You have gained your victory. Give me an honorable pardon. You have put your forces to the test very well today." `Ali then let her go free and sent a group of men and women with her, equipped her, and ordered her to be given 12,000 dirhams.

'Abdallah b. Ja'far thought that was too little and brought out a huge sum for her, saying, "If the Commander of the Faithful does not authorize it, then I will pay it myself."[392]

---

[392] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 16, pp.125 – 128 (The

THE SHI'AH, AISHAH AND HAFSAH

Question 48:

The wives of the Noble Prophet were not excluded from your false accusations. Hafsah and Aisha, Radiyallahu Anha, were subjected to many allegations from your creed. They are the Prophet's beloved wives, yet without fear or favor, they were openly accused in your books, including "Tafsirus Safi" (2/720), "Biharul Anwar" (22/33), "Siradul Mustaqim" by Bayadi (3/165), "Aqaidul-Imamiyyah" by Zanjani (3/85), and almost all Shi'ite books claim that these wives of the Noble Prophet are unbelievers. While Allah says in Qur'an 24:26:

"Bad women are for bad men, and bad men are for bad women. Good women are for good men, and good men are for good women. Such (good people) are innocent of (every) bad statement which they say; for them is forgiveness and generous provision (i.e., paradise)."

Shi'ites should be reasonable in discussion. If someone were to come to you and say that your in-laws are bad people, that your wife is an unbeliever, and that those to whom you have given your daughters in marriage are bad people, what would you think? You are a scholar, and all your students are bad people, with very few exceptions. Imagine spending 23 years with them, during which they gained nothing but disobedience to Allah's command. Who is he trying to refer to as a bad man?

THE REPLY

This is one topic that deserves honesty and scholarship, two qualities our professor had not been able to display so far. For the record, there is no single authentic Shi'ah hadith narrated from any of the Aimmah [the Imams] of Ahl al-Bayt which states exclusively that Aishah and

---

community divided [The Caliphate of the Commander of the Faithful 'Ali b. Abi Talib] – The Events of the Year 36).

Hafsah, the two wives of the Prophet were kuffar [disbelievers]. And the Shi'ah authentic ahadith are the crux of their Aqaeed [faiths].

Of course, there were differing opinions of Shi'ah scholars on those two wives of the Prophet: scholars like Allamah al-Majlisi opined they both became kuffar [unbelievers] while others like al-Saduq denied this. For fairness, how was a controversial opinion suddenly became a school of thought's Aqeedah? It is like the assessments and opinions of the Ahlu Sunnah scholars – Imam Abu Hamid al-Ghazali and Ibn al-Athir – who both expressed that the person that accused the Prophet of raving madness was Umar ibn al-Khattab.[393] On the other hand, other scholars of Ahlu Sunnah argued to the contrary. Then, is it fair to conclude the Sunni school aqeedah is that Umar accused the Prophet of raving madness?

THE TWO OPPOSING VIEWS

Allamah al-Majlisi writes:

His Statement, the Most High {Allāh sets forth an example}, I say: it is not hidden from the well-informed critic and the keen expert what is in these verses in terms of the exposure, rather the explicit declaration, of the hypocrisy of 'Āishah and Ḥafṣah and their kufr (disbelief).[394]

قوله تعالى {ضرب الله مثلا} أقول: لا يخفى على الناقد البصير و الفطن الخبير ما في تلك الآيات من التعريض بل التصريح بنفاق عايشة و حفصة وكفرهما.

First, the noble verse under discussion is in surah al-Tahrim where its third and fourth verses were explicitly

---

[393] See chapter 36 for details.

[394] Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmi'ah li Durar Akhbār al-Aimah al-Aṭhār* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Wafā; 2nd edition, 1403 H), vol. 22, p. 233

directed to Aishah and Hafsah. However, the verse in question is not at them. Allah says:

Allah sets forth an example to those who disbelieve the wife of Nuh and the wife of Lut: they were both under two of Our righteous servants, but they acted treacherously towards them so they availed them naught against Allah, and it was said: Enter both the fire with those who enter.[395]

ضَرَبَ اللَّهُ مَثَلًا لِّلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا امْرَأَتَ نُوحٍ وَامْرَأَتَ لُوطٍ كَانَتَا تَحْتَ عَبْدَيْنِ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا صَالِحَيْنِ فَخَانَتَاهُمَا فَلَمْ يُغْنِيَا عَنْهُمَا مِنَ اللَّهِ شَيْئًا وَقِيلَ ادْخُلَا النَّارَ مَعَ الدَّاخِلِينَ

The clear fact of this verse is that it addresses [those who disbelieve (لِّلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا)] which is in masculine plural pronoun [for men, or men and women together]. On the contrary, the initial verses where Aishah and Hafsah were both addressed, the dual pronoun is used. Here are the verses:

When the Prophet had confided a matter to one of his wives in secret, then, when she disclosed the secret, and Allāh informed him, he made known part of it and overlooked part of it. So when he told her, she asked, "Who informed you of this?" He said, "I was informed by Him Who knows everything and is All-Aware." If you both (women) repent to Allāh, for your both hearts have become crooked and if you plotted against him, you should know that Allāh is his Protector, and after Him Jibrāīl and the righteous believers and the angels are his companions and helpers.[396]

إِذْ أَسَرَّ النَّبِيُّ إِلَىٰ بَعْضِ أَزْوَاجِهِ حَدِيثًا فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَتْ بِهِ وَأَظْهَرَهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ عَرَّفَ بَعْضَهُ وَأَعْرَضَ عَن بَعْضٍ فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَهَا بِهِ قَالَتْ مَنْ أَنبَأَكَ هَاذَا قَالَ نَبَّأَنِيَ الْعَلِيمُ الْخَبِيرُ. إِن تَتُوبَا إِلَى اللَّهِ فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا وَإِن تَظَاهَرَا

---

[395] Surah al-Tahrim: 10

[396] Surah al-Tahrim: 3 – 4

عَلَيْهِ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ مَوْلَاهُ وَجِبْرِيلُ وَصَالِحُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ بَعْدَ ذَالِكَ ظَهِيرٌ.

On the other hand, Sheikh al-Kulayni documents an explicit Shi'i hadith which seems to change the tempo. He records:

Yaḥyā – 'Abd Allāh b. Miskān – Ḍurays:

The people disputed in the presence of Abū Ja'far, peace be upon him. Some of them said, "Those who fought against 'Alī were worse than those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family". Some others among them also said, "Those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family, were worse than those who fought against 'Alī, peace be upon him." Abū Ja'far, peace be upon him, heard them and said, "What are you saying?" They said, "May Allāh keep you well. We disputed about those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family, and those who fought 'Alī, peace be upon him. Some of us said: those who fought against 'Alī, peace be upon him, were worse than those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family. Some of us said: those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family, were worse than those who fought against 'Alī, peace be upon him." Then, Abū Ja'far, peace be upon him, said, "No. Rather, those who fought against 'Alī, peace be upon him, were worse than those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family." So, I said to him, "May I be sacrificed for you. Those who fought against 'Alī, peace be upon him, were worse than those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family?" He replied, "Yes, and I will inform you concerning that. Verily, those who fought against the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him and his family, had not acknowledged Islām. However, those who fought

against 'Alī, peace be upon him, acknowledged Islām, then they denied it."[397]

Al-Majlisī comments: Sahih[398]

Obviously, Lady Aisha was the ring leader of the rebels that fought the rightly guided Caliph of their time. According to this hadith, to wage war against the noble Prophet and the Aimmah [the Imams of his Ahl al-Bayt] is a form of apostasy. But how did Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib solve this quagmire?

Shaykh al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 H) documents:

My father, may Allah be merciful to him – Sa'd b. 'Abd Allah – 'Abd Allah b. Ja'far – Mas'adah b. Ziyad – Ja'far b. Muḥammad – his father, peace be upon them both:

Marwan b. al-Ḥakam said: "When 'Ali, peace be upon him, defeated us at Basra, he returned to the people their properties. Whoever presented evidence, he gave him; and whoever did not present evidence, he made him swear (by Allah). Then, someone said to him, 'O Amir al-Muminin! Distribute the war booty and the war captives among us.' When they became many making repeated demands from him, he said, 'Which of you will take Umm al-Muminin as part of his share?' Then, they stopped."[399]

---

[397] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, *al-Rawḍah min al-Kāfī* (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah) [annotator: 'Alī Akbar al-Ghiffārī], vol. 8, p. 252, # 353

[398] Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Mir-āt al-'Uqūl fī Sharḥ Akhbār Āl al-Rasūl* (Tehran: Dār alKutub al-Islāmīyyah) [annotator: Sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥusaynī al-Amīnī], vol. 26, p. 228

[399] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Mūsā b. Bābūyah al-Qummī, *'Ilal al-Sharāi'* (Najaf: al-Maktabah al-Ḥaydariyyah; 1386 H), vol. 2, p. 603, # 69

أبي رحمه الله قال: حدثنا سعد بن عبد الله عن عبد الله بن جعفر عن مسعدة بن زياد عن جعفر بن محمد عن أبيه عليهما السلام قال: قال مروان بن الحكم لما هزمنا علي عليه السلام بالبصرة رد على الناس أموالهم من أقام بينة أعطاه ومن لم يقم بينة حلفه. قال: فقال له قائل يا أمير المؤمنين أقسم الفئ بيننا والسبي قال فلما أكثروا عليه قال أيكم يأخذ أم المؤمنين في سهمه فكفوا

Ayatullah al-Muhsini comments about the hadith: Mu'tabarah (Reliable)[400]

This hadith confirms that despite the rebellion of Aisha, Amir al-Muminin still regard her as a Muslim and not a Kafir or Mur'tad, at least outwardly. This is the reason the difference between a Muslim and a Mumin is the inward faith. Both of them are Muslim outwardly; but not every Muslim necessarily possesses the true faith. And indeed, it was the inner status of Aisha, according to the Qur'an, that is defective. Again, Allah says:

If you both (women) repent to Allāh, for your both hearts have become crooked and if you plotted against him, you should know that Allāh is his Protector, and after Him Jibrāīl and the righteous believers and the angels are his companions and helpers.

إِن تَتُوبَا إِلَى اللَّهِ فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا وَإِن تَظَاهَرَا عَلَيْهِ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ مَوْلَاهُ وَجِبْرِيلُ وَصَالِحُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ بَعْدَ ذَالِكَ ظَهِيرٌ

Imam al-Qur'tubi writes on this verse:

The Statement of Allah {If you both (women) repent to Allah} referring to Hafsah and 'Aishah upon repentance for what occurred from both in terms of swerving into

---

[400] Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, *Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār* (Beirut: Muasassat al-'Ārif li alMaṭbū'āt; 2nd edition, 1426 H), vol. 2, p. 73

opposition to what the Messenger of Allah loved. {Your hearts have become crooked} meaning, "(Your hearts have) deviated and swerved from the Haqq" and that what loving what the Prophet hated.[401]

قوله تعالى: (إن تتوبا إلى الله) يعني حفصة وعائشة ، حثهما على التوبة على ما كان منهما من الميل إلى خلاف محبة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم . (فقد صغت قلوبكما) أي زاغت ومالت عن الحق.

Imam Jarir al-Tabari also writes on this verse:

Narrated Ibn 'Abbās:

His Statement {If you both (women) repent to Allāh, for your hearts have become crooked} means "your hearts have deviated. Your hearts have committed sins."

Narrated Mujāhid:

"We used to think that His Statement (Your hearts have crooked) is an easy matter until we heared the Qirāh of Ibn Mas'ūd (If you both (women) repent to Allāh, For your hearts have deviated). Narrated Qatādah: (Your hearts have become crooked) means your hearts have swerved.

Narrated al-Dahāk: (Your hearts have become crooked) means "(Your hearts have) deviated". Narrated Sufyān (al-Thawrī): (Your hearts have become crooked) means "Your hearts have deviated".[402]

حدثني محمد بن سعد، قال: ثني أبي، قال: ثني عمي، قال: ثني أبي، عن أبيه، عن ابن عباس، قوله (إِنْ تَتُوبَا إِلَى اللهِ فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا)

---

401 Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Qurtubī, *Al-Jāmi' al-Ahkām al-Qur'ān* (Cairo: Dār al-Shi'b; 1372 H), vol. 18, p. 189 [tafsir surah al-Tahrim, verse 4].

402 Ibn Jarīr al-Tabarī, *Tafsīr*, vol. 23, p. 483 [tafsir surah al-Tahrim]

يقول: زاغت قلوبكما، يقول: قد أثمت قلوبكما. حدثنا ابن حميد، قال: ثنا يحيى بن واضح، قال: ثنا محمد بن طلحة، عن زبيد، عن مجاهد قال: كنا نرى أن قوله (فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا) شيء هين، حتى سمعت قراءة ابن مسعود (إن تَتُوبَا إِلى اللهِ فَقَدْ زَاغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا). حدثنا بشر، قال: ثنا يزيد، قال: ثنا سعيد، عن قتادة (فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا) : أي مالت قلوبكما. حدثنا ابن عبد الأعلى، قال: ثنا ابن ثور، عن قتادة (فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا) مالت قلوبكما. حُدثت عن الحسين، قال: سمعت أبا معاذ يقول: ثنا عبيد، قال: سمعت الضحاك يقول في قوله (فَقَدْ صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا) يقول: زاغت. حدثنا ابن حميد، قال: ثنا مهران، عن سفيان(صَغَتْ قُلُوبُكُمَا) قال: زاغت قلوبكما

And finally, Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both:

I wanted to ask 'Umar. So, I said: "O Amir al-Muminin! Who were these two women who PLOTTED AGAINST the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him?" I could not finish my statement when he said, "'Aishah and Hafsah."[403]

حدثنا عَلِيٌّ حدثنا سُفْيَانُ حدثنا يحيى بن سَعِيدٍ قال سمعت عُبَيْدَ بن حُنَيْنٍ قال سمعت بن عَبَّاسٍ رضي الله عنهما يقول أَرَدْتُ أَنْ أَسْأَلَ عُمَرَ فقلت يا أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ من الْمَرْأَتَانِ اللَّتَانِ تَظَاهَرَتَا على رسول اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فما أَتْمَمْتُ كَلَامِي حتى قال عَائِشَةُ وَحَفْصَةُ.

---

[403] Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī al-Ju'fī, ***Sahih*** (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr; 3rd edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Dr. Mustafā Dīb al-Baghā], vol. 4, p. 1868, # 4630; **Sahih Muslim** (Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi) [annotator: Muhammad Faud Abd al-Baqi], vol.2, p.1105, #1479(31)}; https://sunnah.com/muslim/18/43

What exactly was the sin of the two ladies that Allah had to reveal they plotted against their blessed husband? There are two contradictory accounts in the books of Ahlu Sunnah:

- Imam al-Bukhari documents: Narrated `Aisha:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) used to stay (for a period) in the house of Zainab bint Jahsh (one of the wives of the Prophet) and he used to drink honey in her house. Hafsa and I planned that when the Prophet (peace be upon him) entered upon either of us, she would say, "I smell in you the bad smell of Maghafir (a bad smelling raisin). Have you eaten Maghafir?" When he entered upon one of us, she said that to him. He replied (to her), "No, but I have drunk honey in the house of Zainab bint Jahsh, and I will never drink it again." Then the following verse was revealed: 'O Prophet! Why do you ban (for you) that which Allah has made lawful for you? (upto) If you two (wives of the Prophet (peace be upon him) turn in repentance to Allah.' (66.1-4) The two were `Aisha and Hafsa And also the Statement of Allah: 'And (Remember) when the Prophet (peace be upon him) disclosed a matter in confidence to one of his wives!' (66.3) i.e., his saying, "But I have drunk honey."[404]

حَدَّثَنَا الْحَسَنُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا الْحَجَّاجُ، عَنِ ابْنِ جُرَيْجٍ، قَالَ زَعَمَ عَطَاءٌ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ عُبَيْدَ بْنَ عُمَيْرٍ، يَقُولُ سَمِعْتُ عَائِشَةَ، تَزْعُمُ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم كَانَ يَمْكُثُ عِنْدَ زَيْنَبَ بِنْتِ جَحْشٍ، وَيَشْرَبُ عِنْدَهَا عَسَلاً، فَتَوَاصَيْتُ أَنَا وَحَفْصَةُ أَنَّ أَيَّتَنَا دَخَلَ عَلَيْهَا النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَلْتَقُلْ إِنِّي أَجِدُ مِنْكَ رِيحَ مَغَافِيرَ، أَكَلْتَ مَغَافِيرَ فَدَخَلَ عَلَى إِحْدَاهُمَا فَقَالَتْ ذَلِكَ لَهُ. فَقَالَ لاَ بَلْ شَرِبْتُ عَسَلاً عِنْدَ زَيْنَبَ

[404] Sahih al-Bukhari 6691; In-book reference: Book 83, Hadith 68; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 8, Book 78, Hadith 682; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/83/68

بِنْتِ جَحْشٍ، وَلَنْ أَعُودَ لَهُ فَنَزَلَتْ {يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ لِمَ تُحَرِّمُ مَا أَحَلَّ اللَّهُ لَكَ}، {إِنْ تَتُوبَا إِلَى اللَّهِ}، لِعَائِشَةَ وَحَفْصَةَ، {وَإِذْ أَسَرَّ النَّبِيُّ إِلَى بَعْضِ أَزْوَاجِهِ حَدِيثًا} لِقَوْلِهِ بَلْ شَرِبْتُ عَسَلاً

But how does this story satisfy our curiosity when the first charge to these two wives was:

When the Prophet had confided a matter to one of his wives in secret, then, when she disclosed the secret, and Allāh informed him, he made known part of it and overlooked part of it. So, when he told her, she asked, "Who informed you of this?" He said, "I was informed by Him Who knows everything and is All-Aware."

إِذْ أَسَرَّ النَّبِيُّ إِلَى بَعْضِ أَزْوَاجِهِ حَدِيثًا فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَتْ بِهِ وَأَظْهَرَهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ عَرَّفَ بَعْضَهُ وَأَعْرَضَ عَنْ بَعْضٍ فَلَمَّا نَبَّأَهَا بِهِ قَالَتْ مَنْ أَنبَأَكَ هَاذَا قَالَ نَبَّأَنِيَ الْعَلِيمُ الْخَبِيرُ

Obviously, there is more to this "honey story" even if it is also unpleasant. However, the other contrasting story exposes there is indeed a cover up to what actually happened.

- Imam Nasai documents this authentic hadith:

It was narrated from Anas, that the Messenger of Allah had a female slave with whom he had intercourse, but 'Aishah and Hafsah would not leave him alone until he said that she was forbidden for him. Then Allah, the Mighty and Sublime, revealed: "O Prophet! Why do you forbid (for yourself) that which Allah has allowed to you.' until the end of the Verse.[405]

---

[405] Sunan an-Nasa'i 3959; In-book reference: Book 36, Hadith 21; English translation: Vol. 4, Book 36, Hadith 3411 https://sunnah.com/nasai/36/21

أَخْبَرَنِي إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ يُونُسَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ، حَرَمِيٌّ - هُوَ لَقَبُهُ - قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبِي قَالَ، حَدَّثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ سَلَمَةَ، عَنْ ثَابِتٍ، عَنْ أَنَسٍ، أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم كَانَتْ لَهُ أَمَةٌ يَطَؤُهَا فَلَمْ تَزَلْ بِهِ عَائِشَةُ وَحَفْصَةُ حَتَّى حَرَّمَهَا عَلَى نَفْسِهِ فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ { يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ لِمَ تُحَرِّمُ مَا أَحَلَّ اللَّهُ لَكَ } إِلَى آخِرِ الآيَةِ

Either of the two contradictory stories [to the sabab of the verses] does not fill the gap in the contexts of those verses [1 – 4]. The clear point is whatever the story might be does not really matter compare to the priceless information given about these two wives. And yes! There is no explicit verse in the Qur'an that says either of these wives repented, and there is countless Sunni authentic ahadith[406] which

---

[406] For example: Imam al-Bukhari documents in a long hadith:

Ibn Abbas narrated:

"...He (Umar) said: It so happened that I was thinking about some matter that my wife said: I wish you had done that and that. I said to her: It does not concern you and you should not feel disturbed in a matter which I intend to do. She said to me: How strange is it that you, O son of Khattab, do not like anyone to retort upon you, whereas **your daughter retorts upon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upou him) until he spends the day in vexation**. 'Umar said: I took hold of my cloak, then came out of my house until I visited Hafsa and said to her: O daughter, **(I heard) that you retort upon Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) until he spends the day in vexation**, whereupon Hafsa said: **By Allah, we do retort upon him**. I said: You should bear in mind, my daughter, that I warn you against the punishment of Allah and the wrath of His Messenger (peace be upon him) you may not be misled by one whose beauty has fascinated her, and the love of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) for her..."
Source: Sahih Muslim 1479 b; In-book reference: Book 18, Hadith 41; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 9, Hadith 3508; https://sunnah.com/muslim/18/43
Imam Ahmad also recorded:

Nu'man b. Bashir:

Abu Bakr sought permission to enter the house of the Prophet, peace be upon him, and heard the voice of 'Aisha, very loud, and she was saying

(to the Prophet), "I have known that 'Ali is more beloved to you than my father." She said it twice or thrice. So, Abu Bakr sought permission (again) and entered, and reached for her, and said, "O daughter of such-and-such woman! **Did I hear you raising your voice upon the Messenger of Allah**, peace be upon him?"

Sheik al-Arnaut comment: Its chain is Hasan.
Source: Ahmad b. Hanbal, *Musnad* vol.4, p.275, #18444.

Imam Abi Yala al-Mawsili records:

I ('Āishah) said (to the Prophet), "Are you not the one who pretends to be the Messenger of Allāh?!" He smiled and said, "Are you IN DOUBT, O Umm 'Abd Allāh (i.e. 'Āishah)". I said (to him), "Are you not the one who PRETENDS to be the Messenger of Allāh?! Or, have you changed your mind?" Abū Bakr heard what I said, and he was strict. So, he came to me and hit my face. As a result, the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, said, "Take it easy, O Abū Bakr." He said, "O Messenger of Allāh! Didn't you hear what she said?"

فقلت: ألست تزعم أنك رسول الله؟ قالت: فتبسم قال: أو في شك أنت يا أم عبد الله؟ قالت: قلت: ألست تزعم أنك رسول الله؟ أفهلا عدلت؟ وسمعني أبو بكر وكان فيه غرب أي حدة فأقبل علي فلطم وجهي. فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: مهلا يا أبا بكر. فقال: يا رسول الله أما سمعت ما قالت؟

The hadith is hasan

Source: Abū Ya'lā Ahmad b. 'Alī al-Tamīmī al-Mawsūlī, *Musnad* (Dār al-Māmūn li al-Turāth; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Husayn Salīm Asad], vol. 8, p. 129, # 4670
Imām Muslim also records another scene in the *hadīth* of 'Umar:
I entered upon 'Āishah and said, "O 'Āishah b.t Abū Bakr, I have heard that you HURT the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him". She said, "What is my business with you, O Ibn al-Khattāb? Mind your own defect." I then entered upon Hafsah bint 'Umar and said to her, "O Hafsah, I have heard that you HURT the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him. Verily, I have known that the Messenger of Allāh does NOT love you. If not for me, the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, would have divorced you."

further exposed their insolent attitudes towards their husband; yet, the fact that the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) did not divorce them, and always tried to show love and affection to them clearly showed they still command our respect as "mothers of the believers." However, it is obvious we cannot emulate them in their sinful and evil acts.

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

Narrated Abu Maryam `Abdullah bin Ziyad Al-Aasadi:

When Talha, Az-Zubair and `Aisha moved to Basra, `Ali sent `Ammar bin Yasir and Hasan bin `Ali who came to us at Kufa and ascended the pulpit. Al-Hasan bin `Ali was at the top of the pulpit and `Ammar was below Al-Hasan. We all gathered before him. I heard `Ammar saying, "`Aisha has moved to Al-Busra. By Allah! She is the wife of your of your Prophet in this world and in the Hereafter. But Allah has put you to test whether you obey Him (Allah) or her (`Aisha).[407]

فَدَخَلْتُ عَلَى عَائِشَةَ فَقُلْتُ يَا بِنْتَ أَبِي بَكْرٍ أَقَدْ بَلَغَ مِنْ شَأْنِكِ أَنْ تُؤْذِيَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَقَالَتْ مَا لِي وَمَا لَكَ يَا ابْنَ الْخَطَّابِ عَلَيْكَ بِعَيْبَتِكَ. قَالَ فَدَخَلْتُ عَلَى حَفْصَةَ بِنْتِ عُمَرَ فَقُلْتُ لَهَا يَا حَفْصَةُ أَقَدْ بَلَغَ مِنْ شَأْنِكِ أَنْ تُؤْذِيَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَاللَّهِ لَقَدْ عَلِمْتِ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لاَ يُحِبُّكِ. وَلَوْلاَ أَنَا لَطَلَّقَكِ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Source: Abū al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjāj al-Naysābūrī al-Qushayrī, *Sahīh* (Beirut: Dār Ihyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muhammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 2, p. 1105, # 1479

[407] Sahih al-Bukhari 7100; In-book reference: Book 92, Hadith 51; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 9, Book 88, Hadith 220; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/92/51

FAMILY OF THE NOBLE PROPHET

CHAPTER THIRTY-EIGHT

WIVES AND CHILDREN OF THE PROPHET

Question 49:

Why did you exclude all the children of Muhammad, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, except Fatima as members of the household? What offense have they committed? You excluded Zainab, Ruqayya, Umm Kulthum, Abdullah, Ibrahim, and their eldest brother Al-Qasim. Does their father hate them? Or is he the one who excluded them from his household?

Question 50:

Why did you exclude the wives of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, as part of his household?

Let's be frank and shame the devil. If you are invited to bring your family and you brought everyone but left your wife behind, would you be just to your union and your wife? Why wouldn't you be just to the wives of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam?

Referring back to the Qur'an, the verse that discusses the issue of "Ahlul Bayt" (the household of the Prophet) refers to the wives of Muhammad, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam. The verse that discusses the household of Ibrahim refers to his wife; the household of Lut refers to his wife; and the family of Prophet Musa (Moses) includes his wife as part of his household. Then why on earth should the wives of the Noble Prophet be excluded? For what hatred? What envy and enmity? Please let it subside!

THE REPLY

WHO ARE THE AHL AL-BAYT?

Our loving Professor thought the Shi'ah has the power of selecting the Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet; hence, his protests:

- Why did you exclude all the children of Muhammad Sallahu Alaihi Wasallam expect Fatima as members of the household?
- Why did you exclude the wives of the Noble Prophet Sallahu Alaihi Wasallam as part of his household?

Naturally, all the children and wives of the noble Prophet via bloodline and wedlock respectively are members of his Ahl al-Bayt [household]. Hence, the reason why the wife of Prophet Ibrahim was referred to as "his Ahl al-Bayt." Even by extension, the entire Prophet's extended families and his maids were also members of his family [Ahl].

However, whenever the Shi'ah talks about "the Ahl al-Bayt" in its restricted form to the family of Hazrat Bibi Fatima, it is in respect to:

- Ayah at-Tathir [verse of purification]
- Ayah al-Mubahala [verse of Malediction]
- Hadith al-Thaqalain [two weighty things] or Hadith Khalifatayn [two Caliphs]

This restriction is never the Shi'ah invention rather it is the wish of Allah and His Messenger.

EVIDENCE ONE: VERSE OF PURIFICATION

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 H) documents:

Narrated Umar bin Abi Salamah - the step-son of the Prophet (peace be upon him):

When these Ayat were revealed to the Prophet (peace be upon him): [Allah only wishes to remove the Rijs from you, O Ahl al-Bayt, and to purify you with a thorough purification (33:33)] in the home of Umm Salamah, he called for Fatimah, Hasan, Husain, and wrapped them in the cloak, and Ali was behind him then wrapped him in the cloak; then he said: O Allah! These are my Ahl al-Bayt,

so remove the Rijs from them, and purify them with a thorough purification. So Umm Salamah said: And am I with them O Messenger of Allah? He said: 'You are in your place, and you are upon good."

حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سُلَيْمَانَ الأَصْبَهَانِيُّ، عَنْ يَحْيَى بْنِ عُبَيْدٍ، عَنْ عَطَاءِ بْنِ أَبِي رَبَاحٍ، عَنْ عُمَرَ بْنِ أَبِي سَلَمَةَ، رَبِيبِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ نَزَلَتْ هَذِهِ الآيَةُ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلمَّ : (إِنمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيرًا) فِي بَيْتِ أُمِّ سَلَمَةَ فَدَعَا النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَاطِمَةَ وَحَسَنًا وَحُسَيْنًا فَجَلَّلَهُمْ بِكِسَاءٍ وَعَلِيٌّ خَلْفَ ظَهْرِهِ فَجَلَّلَهُ بِكِسَاءٍ ثُمَّ قَالَ: اللَّهُمَّ هَؤُلاَءِ أَهْلُ بَيْتِي فَأَذْهِبْ عَنْهُمُ الرِّجْسَ وَطَهِّرْهُمْ تَطْهِيرًا . قَالَتْ أُمُّ سَلَمَةَ وَأَنَا مَعَهُمْ يَا نَبِيَّ اللَّهِ قَالَ: أَنْتِ عَلَى مَكَانِكِ وَأَنْتِ إِلَى خَيْرٍ

Al-Albani comments: Sahih (authentic)[408]

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403H) also document:

Umm Salamah said: In my house, it was revealed (Allah only wishes to remove the Rijs from you, O Ahl al-Bayt, and to purify you with a thorough purification). Then, the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, sent for 'Alī, Fātimah, al-Hasan and al-Husayn and said: "O Allah! These are my Ahl al-Bayt." Umm Salamah said: O Messenger of Allah! Am I not part of Ahl al-Bayt? He (the Messenger of Allah) said: You are of my good family, while these are my ahl al-Bayt."[409]

---

[408] Abū 'Īsā Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Sulamī al-Tirmidhī, *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan al-Tirmidhī* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'arif li-Nashar wa at-Tawzi') [annotator: Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī], p. 855 # 3787

[409] Al-Hakim Nayshaburi, *al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain*, (Dar al-Kitab al-Illmiyyah, 1st Edition, 1411H), vol 3, p.158, #4705

Comments: This hadith is authentic with the condition of al-Bukhari

In his Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Azeem, Ibn Kathir documents the above hadith with this ending:

فقلت : يا رسول [ص: 413] الله ، ألست من أهل البيت؟ فقال: إنك إلى خير، أنت من أزواج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قالت : وفي البيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ، وعلي ، وفاطمة ، والحسن ، والحسين ،رضي الله عنهم

She (Umm Salamah) said: O Messenger of Allah, aren't I from Ahl al-bayt? Then he (Prophet) said: You are upon good, you are from wives of the Prophet, peace be upon him. She said: And in the Bayt (house) of Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, is Ali, and Fatima, and Hassan, and Hussein, may Allah be please with them.[410]

Imam Muslim also documents in his Sahih similar hadith on the authority of Aisha.[411]

PRECISE EXPLANATION OF IMAM IBN ASAKIR SHAFI'IY

Imam Ibn Asakir (d. 571 A. H) also documents this hadith with yet another version:

عن أم سلمة - رضي الله عنها – قالت:

---

[410] Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, Sahih Muslim – Arabic English [Darussalam, Riyadh], vol. 6, book 44. Virtues of the Sahabah, Chapter 9. The virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt], pg. 284, hadith 6261 (2424).

[411] al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Azeem* (Saudi: Dar Taybah, 1st Edition 1418H)[annotator: Sami ibn Muhammad Salamah], vol. 6, pg. 412 – 413

نزلت هذه الآية في بيتي (إنما يريد الله ليذهب عنكم الرجس أهل البيت) قالت: يا رسول الله ، ألست من أهل البيت؟

قال: إنك إلى خير ، أنت من أزواج رسول الله

قالت : و أهل البيت: رسول الله وعلي وفاطمة والحسن والحسين ،رضي الله عنهم أجمعين.

... هذا حديث صحيح

From Umm Salamah (may Allah be pleased with her) who said:

This verse was revealed in my house [Allah only wishes to remove the Rijs from you, O Ahl al-Bayt, and to purify you with a thorough purification].

She said: O Messenger of Allah, aren't I from Ahl al-bayt?

He (Prophet) said: You are upon good, you are from the wives of Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him.

She said: And the Ahl al-Bayt: Messenger of Allah, Ali, Fatima, Hassan and Hussein, may Allah be please with them all.

Imam Ibn Asakir comments: This hadith is authentic...

Then, after discussing the chain and variation of the hadith, he then comments:

وقولها: و أهل البيت هؤلاء الذين ذكرتهم إشارة إلى الذين وجدوا في البيت في تلك الحالة وإلا فآل رسول الله

صلى الله عليه و عليهم كلهم أهل بيته و الآية نزلت خاصة في هؤلاء المذكورين. والله أعلم.

And her saying: [And the Ahl al-Bayt] are those whom she mentioned referring to those who were found in the house

at that time (i.e the Prophet, Ali, Fatima, al-Hasan and al-Husein], otherwise the entire family of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and all of them, are the people of his house, but the verse was revealed specifically over those mentioned. God knows.[412]

The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, Umm Salamah and Ibn Asakir [and several other scholars] interpreted that the verse was revealed independently and specifically for the Prophet, Ali, Fatima, al-Hasan and al-Husein with the exclusion of the wives of the Prophet of Allah. Perhaps, the context in which this independent verse is found [perhaps due to verses arrangements] is what confused some Sunni scholars, and instead of submitting to the Prophetic authentic hadith which explains the verse and clarifies the confusion, they decided to play games with the verse saying it is for the wives of the Prophet.

---

[412] Abu Mansur Abd ar-Rahman ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hasan Ibn Hibbatillah ibn Asakir, *Kitab al-Ar'bain fi manaqib Umma'ati-l-Mu'mineen* [Dar al-Fikr], page 105 – 106.

EVIDENCE TWO: VERSE OF MALEDICTION [MUBAHALA]

The verse of Mubahala was revealed in the 9th Hijrah, a year to the demise of the noble Prophet. There was a dialogue between the Prophet and the Priests of Najrani Christians. Despite the convincing argument of the Prophet, these Priests were stubborn and insincere. Then, Allah reveals:

"But whoever disputes with you in this matter after what has come to you of knowledge, then say: 'Come let us call our sons and your sons and our women and your women and ourselves and yourselves, then let us invoke the wrath of Allah upon the liars."[413]

Imam Muslim documents:

Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas narrates: ...And when this verse was revealed: [Let us summon our children and your children...]. Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) called Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain and said: O Allah, these are my Ahl.[414]

وَلَمَّا نَزَلَتْ هَذِهِ الآيَةُ فَقُلْ (تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَأَبْنَاءَكُمْ ...) دَعَا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم عَلِيًّا وَفَاطِمَةَ وَحَسَنًا وَحُسَيْنًا فَقَالَ: اللَّهُمَّ هَؤُلَاءِ أَهْلِي

Imam al-Hakim (d. 403H) also declares:

There have been Mutawatir reports in the Tafsir Books from Abd 'Allah b. Abbas and others that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, on the Day of al-Mubahala, held the hands of 'Ali, Hasan and Husein, and they positioned Fatima behind them. Then he said, "These are our sons, ourselves and our women, so bring yourselves,

---

[413] Surah Aal-Imran: 60

[414] Sahih Muslim 2404 d; In-book reference: Book 44, Hadith 50; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 31, Hadith 5915; https://www.sunnah.com/muslim/44/50

your sons and your women. Then we do Mubahala and place the curse of Allah upon the liars (among us)"[415]

With clear reference to sura Ahzab verse 30, 32, wives of the Prophet are exclusively referred to as "Nisa'a (women) of Nabi [Prophet of Allah]", and this verse of mubahala in the same plural form ask the Prophet to call out his "Nisa'a (women)" alongside "ourselves and our sons (all in the same plural form)". While the Prophet interpreted "our sons" to be Hasan and Husein, and "ourselves" to be "himself and Ali", we expect "our women" to include his wives and only surviving daughter at that time. Alas! All his 9 or 11 wives were left out when this verse was revealed and practically followed few months to the death of the Prophet. Only Fatima was singly picked to be "our women". Then, the Prophet never stops at that until he declared, "O Allah, these are my AHL".

Were they [Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husein] not already (known as) his Ahl [household] by virtue of their blood and birth relations to him? Obviously, they were known to be his Ahl far before this declaration but Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) made these emphasis (in the two hadiths relating to verse of purification and verse of malediction) to show that those verses were exclusively revealed for those five souls who were alive that time.

EVIDENCE THREE: HADITH AL-THAQALAYN [TWO WEIGHTY THINGS]

Imam al-Tirmidhi documents a mutawattir [widely reported] hadith called Hadith al-Thaqalayn. For brevity, we quote two versions of the hadith.

- Narrated Zayd b. Arqam:

Allāh's Apostle said: "I will leave among you what if you adhere to it you will never go astray after me. One of them

---

[415] *Kitab Ma'rifah 'Ulum al-Hadith* [Beirut: Manshurah Dar al-Afaq al-Hadith, 4th Ed, 1400H], p.50

BOTH is greater than the other: the Book of Allāh, a rope stretching from the heavens to the earth, AND my 'itrah [offspring], my Ahl al-Bayt. Both shall never separate until they meet me at the Lake-Font. Watch carefully how you treat them both after me.[416]

حدثنا علي بن المنذر الكوفي ، حدثنا محمد بن فضيل حدثنا الأعمش عن عطية عن أبي سعيد ، والأعمش عن

حبيب بن أبي ثابت عن زيد بن أرقم قالا : قال رسول الله : إني تارك فيكم ما إن تمسكتم به لن تضلوا بعدي ،

أحدهما أعظم من الآخر : كتاب الله حبل ممدود من السماء إلى الأرض وعترتي أهل بيتي ، ولن يفترقا حتى

) يردا علي الحوض ، فانظروا كيف تخلفوني فيهما.) صحيح

- Narrated Jabir bin Abdillah:

I saw the Messenger of Allah during his last Hajj, on the day of 'Arafah. He was upon his camel Qaswa, giving a khutbah, so he said: 'O people! Indeed, I have left over you that which if you hold fast to it, you will never go astray: The Book of Allah and my 'itrah [offspring], my Ahl al-Bayt.[417]

Of course, wives are not a man's "itrah" therefore; this hadith negates the inclusion of the wives of noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny). Likewise, the only surviving child of the Prophet at that time was Bibi Fatimah, and it is only from her that the "itrah [offspring]"

---

[416] Muhammad Nāsir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Sahīh Sunan al-Tirmidhī* (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ma'ārif; 1420 H), vol. 3, p. 543, # 3788

[417] Hafiz Abu Eisa Muhammad ibn Eisa at-Tirmidhi, *Jami' at-Tirmidhi* – Arabic-English version (Riyadh: Darussalam) [annotator: Hafiz Abu Tahir Zubair Ali Za'i], vol. 6, p. 435, hadith 3786

of our noble Prophet was preserved via al-Hasan and al-Husein.

AN OBJECTION OVERRULED

Some Ahlu Sunnah often advance another point in the narration of Ikrimah to prove that the wives of the Prophet were amongst those addressed in the "verse of purification." Hafiz Ibn Kathir documents:

وَهَكَذَا رَوَى ابْنُ أَبِي حَاتِمٍ قَالَ:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ حَرْبٍ الْمَوْصِلِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا زَيْدُ بْنُ الْحُبَاب، حَدَّثَنَا حُسَيْنُ بْنُ وَاقِدٍ، عَنْ يَزِيدَ النَّحْوِيِّ، عَنْ عِكْرِمَةَ عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ فِي قَوْلِهِ: ﴿إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ﴾ قَالَ: نَزَلَتْ فِي نِسَاءِ النَّبِيِّ (ص) خاصة.

This is how Ibn Abi Hatim narrated: Ali ibn Harb Musli narrated to us, from Zaid bin Hubab, from Hussein bin Waked, from Yazid an-Nahwi, from Ikrima from Ibn Abbas as saying: [God only desires to remove impurity from you, People of the House]. He said: It was revealed specifically over the wives of the Prophet, peace be upon him.[418]

Although, the chain of this narration is classified authentic; however, its matn (text) creates a major problem when it says:

نَزَلَتْ فِي نِسَاءِ النَّبِيِّ (ص) خاصة

It was revealed SPECIFICALLY over the wives of the Prophet, peace be upon him"

First, if it was revealed specifically over the wives of the Prophet, then why would Allah use masculine pronoun (عَنْكُمُ) in the ayah [إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ],

---

[418] al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Azeem* (Saudi: Dar Taybah, 1st Edition 1418H) [annotator: Sami ibn Muhammad Salamah], vol. 6, pg. 410

deviating from initial and afterward feminine pronouns (كُنَّ) that addressed the wives repetitively?

This is the grave danger that some Ahlu Sunnah scholars saw; thereby, propounded another argument that, "Yes, the masculine pronoun indicates a different group from the wives; yet, the wives were also inclusive." Unfortunately, this excuse has not solved the problem yet: it is attributed to Ibn Abbas that he said, "the verse was revealed SPECIFICALLY (خاصة) over the wives." So, the question still stands: why would Allah use Masculine pronoun for females?

There is absolutely no doubt that the matn (text) of the narration has either been tampered with or entirely fabricated as Ibn Abbas could not fall into such error.

Second, the narration from Zayd ibn Arqam in Sahih Muslim completely etched the wives of the Prophet from his Ahl al-Bayt with respect to Hadith al-Thaqalayn.

Imam Muslim documents:

Yazid b. Hayyan reported: We went to him (Zaid b. Arqam) and said to him...:

فَقُلْنَا مَنْ أَهْلُ بَيْتِهِ نِسَاؤُهُ قَالَ لاَ وَايْمُ اللَّهِ إِنَّ الْمَرْأَةَ تَكُونُ مَعَ الرَّجُلِ الْعَصْرَ مِنَ الدَّهْرِ ثُمَّ يُطَلِّقُهَا فَتَرْجِعُ إِلَى أَبِيهَا وَقَوْمِهَا أَهْلُ بَيْتِهِ أَصْلُهُ وَعَصَبَتُهُ الَّذِينَ حُرِمُوا الصَّدَقَةَ بَعْدَهُ.

... We said: Who are amongst the members of the household? Aren't the wives (of the Holy Prophet) included amongst the members of his house hold? Thereupon he said: No, by Allah, a woman lives with a man (as his wife) for a certain period; he then divorces her and she goes back to her parents and to her people; the members of his household include his ownself and his kith and kin (who are related to him by blood) and for him the acceptance of Zakat is prohibited.

And in the aforementioned hadith al-Thaqalayn of the same Zayd ibn Ar'qam documented by Imam al-Tirmidhi, the word "(عترتي أهل البيتي) - my offspring, bloodline, Ahl al-Bayt" is used as oppose to (only) "Ahl al-Bayt" in Sahih Muslim. Therefore, in whatever angle it is viewed, the wives of the Prophet were not part of his Ahl al-Bayt with respect to "verse of purification, verse of mubahala and hadith al-Thaqalayn."[419]

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROPHET'S HOUSEHOLD AND THE COMPANIONS

[419] Sahih Muslim 2408d; In-book reference: Book 44, Hadith 58; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 31, Hadith 5923: https://sunnah.com/muslim:2408d

CHAPTER THIRTY-NINE

THE NOBLE PROPHET'S IN-LAWS

Question 51:

It is a well-established principle that Islam commands us to choose the right and conscientious person in marriage, whether to marry or to give someone in marriage. This is why our Noble Prophet advises us to have good in-laws.

Why should the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, marry from a household and a daughter of personalities who are of questionable character? He married the daughter of Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, whom you regard as a bastard (an illegitimate child). This was the opinion of Bahrani in his book titled "Al-Kaskul" (3/212). Furthermore, in the Shiite book by Al-Jazairi titled "Al-Anwar al-Nu'maniyyah" (1/63), it is stated that Umar had a mental illness (lunacy) that only subsided with homosexuality! If narrating an issue of disbelief does not amount to disbelief, this story would not be narrated; yet it is present in your books.

Why should the Noble Prophet marry his daughter if what you are saying is a fact? How would you feel if your in-law were referred to as a bastard, fornicator, and homosexual?

THE REPLY

First, as we have hinted previously, there is a big difference between scholars' opinions and the Aqeedah [especially, the usul al-madhhab] of a school. If the opinion of scholars on a particular issue varies, it is irrational to take one view of a group of scholars or an individual scholar, and label it as "aqeedah" of the school they belong. This is the biggest mistake our professor continue to make. Once he [the Professor] sees any Shi'a scholar with a strange opinion,

then he accuses all the members of that school of having same thought.

Allamah Nimat'Allah Musawi al-Jazahiri, Sheikh Yusuf Bahrani [both of whom the Professor has quoted] or any other Shi'ah scholars for that matter are entitled to their respective opinion. And the fact that each of these scholars was not the founder of Shi'i school of thought, then how can the school carry the weight of his opinion? Nonetheless, we shall soon expose what al-Jazahiri actually "said" in his book about Umar ibn al-Khattab.

Second, the use of bad epithtets, abuses and cursing were institutionalized by Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan [the historical founder of Ahlu Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah] during his reign as the first king of Bani Umayyad dynasty. It was a Sunnah [practise] of Mu'awiyah which lasted for eight decades [80 years] that Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib and other members of the noble Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt [peace be upon them all] be abused and cursed on the minbar. Their Shi'ah [followers] who refused or reacted to that insanity were unjustly persecuted and murdered. However, during the reign of Caliph Umar ibn Abdul-Azeez, the only righteous Caliph of Bani Ummayyad dynasty, a stop was put to the madness. Unfortunately, these evil Sunnan [practices] of Mu'awiyyah continued at the reign of the Abbasid dynasty after Umar ibn Abdul-Azeez was murdered. Naturally, some of the Shi'ah [followers] of Ali and Ahl al-Bayt reacted and paid back their opponents in the same coin leading to the abuses and cursing of Abu Bakr, Umar [who surprisingly threatened to burn the house of Hazrat Fatima and whoever was in it in the bid to force people to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr after the Saqifah incident] et al. Each school did not only declare the other kuffar [disbelievers] but also killed and persecuted each other at anytime the chance present itself. The effect of this unfortunate dichotomy continues till date. Therefore, it is either hypocrisy or ignorance on the part of the Professor as he tried to play saint and paint his opponent black.

Third, what were the responses of the Professor and people like him to those sahabah who planned to assassinate the

Prophet at Aqabah? What were their reactions to those sahabah who accused the noble Prophet of raving madness on his death-bed? The Professor [and his likes] continues to celebrate them as "righteous sahabah" and give series of flimsy excuses to vindicate these sahabah. Yet, if a Shi'ah scholar "abuses" Umar or any sahabi he found suspicious and controversial, then he is a kaafir. Where is the fairness?

Fourth, what exactly were the statements of al-Bahrani and al-Jazahiri? The Professor writes:

He married the daughter of Umar Radiyallahu Anhu whom you regard him as a bastard (an illegitimate child). This was the opinion of Bahrani in his book titled "Al-kaskul" (3/212). Furthermore, in the book of Aljazairi (Shiite) titled "Al-Anwarum Nu'umaniyyah" (1/63) he said; Umar has a mental illness (lunatic) that only subside with homosexuality!

On the other hand, this is what Allamah Nimat Allah al-Jazahiri writes:

Among the strange things narrated about al-Khattab, the father of Umar ibn al-Khattab, is that he was a thief and that his hand was cut off for theft. This was mentioned by Abu Ubaid al-Qasim ibn Sallam in his book Al-Shihab, in the section listing those from Quraysh who had their hands cut off for theft during the pre-Islamic period. He said, in these exact words:

"Al-Khattab ibn Nufayl ibn Abd al-Uzza ibn Riyah ibn Adi ibn Ka'b, the father of Umar ibn al-Khattab, had his hand cut off for stealing a pot. This fact was erased during Umar's rule, and the people were pleased with him."

Some Muslims said: "I am amazed at a people who narrate that Umar was born out of wedlock, that he was a donkey trader in the pre-Islamic period, that his father was a thief, and that he was only known as 'Umair' due to his lowly status. Yet, despite all this, they made him a caliph, standing in the place of their Prophet, a deputy of God over His servants, and preferred him over those who had no blemish in their lineage, honor, or status.

Would that they, when they appointed him and disgraced themselves with this, had at least refrained from transmitting such reports, which became a source of mockery for their enemies and revealed their ignorance of the status of prophets and the legitimacy of the caliphate."[420]

ومن عجيب ما رووه عن الخطاب والد عمر بن الخطاب أنه كان سراق و قطع في السرقة، ما ذكره أبو عبيد القسم بن سلام في كتاب الشهاب، في تسمية من قطع من قريش في الجاهلية في السرقة ما هذا لفظه، قال والخطاب بن نفيل بن عبد العزى بن رياح بن عدي بن كعب أبو عمر بن الخطاب، قطعت يده في سرقة قدر ومحاه ولاية عمر ورضى الناس عنه قال بعض المسلمين أتعجب من قوم رووا أن عمر كان ولد زنا، وأنه كان في الجاهلية نخاس الحمير و أنه كان أبوه سراقا وأنه ما كان يعرف إلا بعمير لرذالته ثم مع هذا جعلوه خليفة قائما مقام نبيهم ونائبا عن الله في عباده وقدموه على من لا طعن عليه في حسب ولا نسب ولا إرب ولا سبب ويا ليتهم حيث ولوه وفضحوا أنفسهم بذلك كانوا قد سكتوا عن نقل هذا الأحاديث التي قد شمت بها الأعداء وجعلوها طريقا إلى جهلهم بمقام الأنبياء وخلافة الخلفاء.

Likewise, Sheikh Yusuf Bahrani equally writes:

There is no textual or juristic disagreement regarding his (i.e., Umar's) status as the son of adultery, nor regarding the occurrence of adultery in his forefathers as well.

---

[420] Nimat Allah Musawi al-Jazahiri, Al-Anwar al-Nu'maniyyah (Beirut: Muasasah al-A'laami al-Matbua'ah, 1431) vol.1, Pg. 69

لا خلاف نصا وفتوى في كونه – أي عمر – إبن زنا وكذا حصول الزنا في آبائه أيضا

So, it turns out that these two Shi'ah sheikhs were reacting to certain "narrations" of Abu Ubaid al-Qasam ibn Salam (d. 224 H), a Sunni Imam of hadith, history and Fiqh; which he mentioned in his book "Al-Shehab." And it was on these narrations they drew out their "opinions" from. What is the problem in this? What is expected of our professor is to investigate "these narrations" and prove their falsity.

Lastly, the reason why the noble Prophet married Umar's daughter, apart from her, being a Muslim was stated in the very word of Umar ibn al-Khattab. Imam Bukhari documents:

Narrated`Abdullah-bin`Umar:

`Umar bin Al-Khattab said, "When (my daughter) Hafsa bint `Umar lost her husband Khunais bin Hudhaifa As-Sahmi who was one of the companions of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and had fought in the battle of Badr and had died in Medina, I met `Uthman bin `Affan and suggested that he should marry Hafsa saying, "If you wish, I will marry Hafsa bint `Umar to you, on that, he said, 'I will think it over.' I waited for a few days and then he said to me. I am of the opinion that I shall not marry at present. Then I met Abu Bakr and said, 'if you wish, I will marry you, Hafsa bint `Umar.'

He kept quiet and did not give me any reply and I became angrier with him than I was with `Uthman. Some days later, Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) demanded her hand in marriage and I married her to him. Later on Abu Bakr met me and said, "perhaps you were angry with me when you offered me Hafsa for marriage and I gave no reply to you?' I said, 'Yes.' Abu Bakr said, 'Nothing prevented me from accepting your offer except that I learnt that Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) had referred to the issue of Hafsa and I did not want to disclose the

secret of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him), but had he (i.e. the Prophet) given her up I would surely have accepted her."[421]

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْيَمَانِ، أَخْبَرَنَا شُعَيْبٌ، عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ، قَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي سَالِمُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ عُمَرَ ـ رضى الله عنهما ـ يُحَدِّثُ أَنَّ عُمَرَ بْنَ الْخَطَّابِ حِينَ تَأَيَّمَتْ حَفْصَةُ بِنْتُ عُمَرَ مِنْ خُنَيْسِ بْنِ حُذَافَةَ السَّهْمِيِّ وَكَانَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَدْ شَهِدَ بَدْرًا تُوُفِّيَ بِالْمَدِينَةِ قَالَ عُمَرُ فَلَقِيتُ عُثْمَانَ بْنَ عَفَّانَ فَعَرَضْتُ عَلَيْهِ حَفْصَةَ فَقُلْتُ إِنْ شِئْتَ أَنْكَحْتُكَ حَفْصَةَ بِنْتَ عُمَرَ. قَالَ سَأَنْظُرُ فِي أَمْرِي. فَلَبِثْتُ لَيَالِيَ، فَقَالَ قَدْ بَدَا لِي أَنْ لاَ أَتَزَوَّجَ يَوْمِي هَذَا. قَالَ عُمَرُ فَلَقِيتُ أَبَا بَكْرٍ فَقُلْتُ إِنْ شِئْتَ أَنْكَحْتُكَ حَفْصَةَ بِنْتَ عُمَرَ. فَصَمَتَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ، فَلَمْ يَرْجِعْ إِلَىَّ شَيْئًا، فَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِ أَوْجَدَ مِنِّي عَلَى عُثْمَانَ، فَلَبِثْتُ لَيَالِيَ، ثُمَّ خَطَبَهَا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَأَنْكَحْتُهَا إِيَّاهُ، فَلَقِيَنِي أَبُو بَكْرٍ فَقَالَ لَعَلَّكَ وَجَدْتَ عَلَىَّ حِينَ عَرَضْتَ عَلَىَّ حَفْصَةَ فَلَمْ أَرْجِعْ إِلَيْكَ قُلْتُ نَعَمْ. قَالَ فَإِنَّهُ لَمْ يَمْنَعْنِي أَنْ أَرْجِعَ إِلَيْكَ فِيمَا عَرَضْتَ إِلاَّ أَنِّي قَدْ عَلِمْتُ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَدْ ذَكَرَهَا، فَلَمْ أَكُنْ لأُفْشِيَ سِرَّ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم، وَلَوْ تَرَكَهَا لَقَبِلْتُهَا2

And Imam Muslim gives us more information about Hazrat Hafsa. Again, Umar narrates:

---

[421] Sahih al-Bukhari 4005; In-book reference : Book 64, Hadith 56; fUSC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 342 https://sunnah.com/bukhari/64/56

فَدَخَلْتُ عَلَى عَائِشَةَ فَقُلْتُ يَا بِنْتَ أَبِي بَكْرٍ أَقَدْ بَلَغَ مِنْ شَأْنِكِ أَنْ تُؤْذِي رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَقَالَتْ مَا لِي وَمَا لَكَ يَا ابْنَ الْخَطَّابِ عَلَيْكَ بِعَيْبَتِكَ. قَالَ فَدَخَلْتُ عَلَى حَفْصَةَ بِنْتِ عُمَرَ فَقُلْتُ لَهَا يَا حَفْصَةُ أَقَدْ بَلَغَ مِنْ شَأْنِكِ أَنْ تُؤْذِي رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَاللَّهِ لَقَدْ عَلِمْتِ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لاَ يُحِبُّكِ. وَلَوْلاَ أَنَا لَطَلَّقَكِ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

I entered upon 'Āishah and said, "O 'Aishah b.t Abu Bakr, I have heard that you HURT the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him". She said, "What is my business with you, O Ibn al-Khattab? Mind your own defect." I then entered upon Hafsah bint 'Umar and said to her, "O Hafsah, I have heard that you HURT the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. Verily, I have known that the Messenger of Allah does NOT love you. If not for me, the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, would have divorced you."[422]

There is no controversy as to the fact that some of the marriages of the Prophet with certain women were out of favour and kindness of the Prophet to his Ummah. Hafsah fell into this category of favour. The marriage of Hafsah with the Prophet has nothing to do with her grandfather's past [being a thief, fornicator and idolator according to certain narration] or even her father's past being this or that. She was simply a Muslim woman who needed favour at a time when none seemed to be forthcoming.

MARRIAGE OF "AHL AL-BAYT" WITH THE SAHABAH

---

[422] Abū al-Husayn Muslim b. al-Hajjāj al-Naysābūrī al-Qushayrī, *Sahīh* (Beirut: Dār Ihyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī) [annotator: Muhammad Fuād 'Abd al-Bāqī], vol. 2, p. 1105, # 1479; https://sunnah.com/muslim/18/40

Question 52:

Why did "Ahlul Bayt" marry the daughters of the companions? How can they (the companions) and "Ahlul Bayt" become in-laws while they are enemies? The beliefs of the Shi'ites often insinuate that the companions circumvented the Prophet's household and held them in hostility. All that the Shi'ites seem to pursue is the proclamation of denied freedom. This has led them to visit their tombs and pray for them against their enemies (i.e., the companions). But why were they in-laws in the first place? Let's provide some illustrations:

From the beginning, the Noble Prophet had in-laws. Who were his in-laws? Whose daughters were his eleven wives? If you disagree that not all of his in-laws were companions, then what about Aisha and Hafsah?

Whom did he marry his daughters to? It is surprising that many of us are unaware that the Prophet had four daughters whom he gave in marriage. We all know about his last daughter, Fatima, but the other three daughters were married into the family of Banu Umayyad. Abu Asim bin Rabi'ah was his first son-in-law, having married his eldest daughter, Zainab; he is a member of the Umayyad clan. The Noble Prophet praised him as follows: "We became in-laws with him; we were happy with his gesture; he promised us and fulfilled his promise."

The next two daughters, Rukayya and Umm Kulthum, were married to Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, separately. In the history of mankind, there is no one who has been privileged to marry two daughters of a Prophet except Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, a member of Banu Umayyad. This earned him the title "Dhun Nurain," or "Owner of Two Illuminating Lights." This is because whoever marries the daughter of a Prophet is blessed with "illuminating light," and Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, was blessed with two.

To support this thesis, let's focus solely on the house of Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu. The eldest son of Uthman,

Aban bin Uthman, married Umm Kulthum bint Abdullah bin Ja'far bin Abu Talib.

Furthermore, Musa bin Aban (the grandson of Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu) married Umm al-Qasim bint Al-Hassan, i.e., the granddaughter of Al-Hassan bin Ali bin Abi Talib. Additionally, another grandson of Uthman, Zaid bin Asim bin Uthman, married Sukainah bint Hussain bin Ali. In the history of Arabia, it has been narrated that there was never a more beautiful Arabian lady than her (Sukainah), whose beauty rivaled that of Aishah bint Dalha bin Ubaidullah. Again, Abdullah bin Aban bin Uthman married Fatima bint Hussain bin Abu Talib, who is a younger sister to Sukainah.

All these marital relationships are with only one companion who is a clergyman from Banu Umayyad. Aside from all this, are you aware that Yazid bin Mu'awiyyah—whom the Shi'ites accuse of assassinating Hussain—was married to "Ahlul Bayt," specifically Umm Kulthum bint Abdullah bin Abbas bin Abdul-Mutalib? They had two children named Amr and Abdullah.

Wow! How true are your stories in trying to establish hatred between Ahlul Bayt and the companions? Or are they myths without source?

THE REPLY

The summary of the Professor's explanations [the main question] has already been stated in his introduction. He writes:

Why did "Ahlulbait" marry the daughters of the companions? How should they (companions) & "Ahlulbait" become in-laws while they are enemies? The creeds of Shi'ites always insinuate that the companions circumvented the Prophet's household. They held them hostile etc. All that Shi'ites are after is proclaiming the denied freedom. This led them to be visiting their tomb and praying for them against their enemies i.e. (companions)? But why were they in-laws in the first place?

First, by Ahl al-Bayt [or Ahlulbait], the Professor meant Prophet's household in general, and not the "special Ahl al-Bayt"[423] whom Allah has purified absolutely.

Second, the minimum requirement for marriage (in general) is Islam. If someone declares Islam (outward belief), he or she is entitled to marry any other Muslim suitor. Sheikh Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni documents:

عَلِيٌّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ ابْنِ أَبِي عُمَيْرٍ عَنْ جَمِيلِ بْنِ دَرَّاجٍ عَنْ فُضَيْلِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ قَالَ

سَمِعْتُ أَبَا عَبْدِ اللَّهِ(عليه السلام) يَقُولُ إِنَّ الْإِيمَانَ يُشَارِكُ الْإِسْلَامَ وَ لَا يُشَارِكُهُ الْإِسْلَامُ إِنَّ الْإِيمَانَ مَا وَقَرَ فِي الْقُلُوبِ وَ الْإِسْلَامَ مَا عَلَيْهِ الْمَنَاكِحُ وَ الْمَوَارِيثُ وَ حَقْنُ الدِّمَاءِ وَ الْإِيمَانُ يَشْرَكُ الْإِسْلَامَ وَ الْإِسْلَامُ لَا يَشْرَكُ الْإِيمَانَ

Ali has narrated from his father from ibn abu 'Umayr from Jamil ibn Darraj from Fudayl ibnYasar who has said the following:

"I heard abu 'Abd Allah, peace be upon him, saying, 'Belief is inclusive of Islam but Islam is not inclusive of it. Belief is what sits in the heart and Islam is that which legalizes marriages and inheritance and protects lives. Belief is inclusive of Islam but Islam is not inclusive of belief.'[424]

Sheikh al-Kulayni also documents:

---

[423] See chapter 40.

[424] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *Usul al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1427 H) [Bab al-Iman wa al-Kufr], vol. 2, pg. 19 – 20, chapter 15, Hadith #3

مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَحْيَي عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ مَحْبُوبٍ عَنْ جَمِيلِ بْنِ صَالِحٍ عَنْ سَمَاعَةَ قَالَ:

قُلْتُ لِأَبِي عَبْدِ اللَّهِ(عليه السلام) أَخْبِرْنِي عَنِ الْإِسْلَامِ وَ الْإِيمَانِ أَ هُمَا مُخْتَلِفَانِ فَقَالَ إِنَّ الْإِيمَانَ يُشَارِكُ الْإِسْلَامَ وَ الْإِسْلَامَ لَا يُشَارِكُ الْإِيمَانَ فَقُلْتُ فَصِفْهُمَا لِي فَقَالَ الْإِسْلَامُ شَهَادَةُ أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَ التَّصْدِيقُ بِرَسُولِ اللَّهِ(صلى الله عليه و آله وسلم) بِهِ حُقِنَتِ الدِّمَاءُ وَ عَلَيْهِ جَرَتِ الْمَنَاكِحُ وَ الْمَوَارِيثُ وَ عَلَى ظَاهِرِهِ جَمَاعَةُ النَّاسِ وَ الْإِيمَانُ الْهُدَى وَ مَا يَثْبُتُ فِي الْقُلُوبِ مِنْ صِفَةِ الْإِسْلَامِ وَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنَ الْعَمَلِ بِهِ وَ الْإِيمَانُ أَرْفَعُ مِنَ الْإِسْلَامِ بِدَرَجَةٍ إِنَّ الْإِيمَانَ يُشَارِكُ الْإِسْلَامَ فِي الظَّاهِرِ وَ الْإِسْلَامَ لَا يُشَارِكُ الْإِيمَانَ فِي الْبَاطِنِ وَ إِنِ اجْتَمَعَا فِي الْقَوْلِ وَ الصِّفَةِ

Muhammad ibn Yahya has narrated Ahmad ibn Muhammad from ai-Hassan ibn Mahbub from Jamil ibn Salih from Sama'a who has said the following:

"I requested abu 'Abd Allah, recipient of divine supreme covenant, 'Teach me about Islam and belief. Are they different?' He said, 'Belief is inclusive of Islam but Islam is not inclusive of belief.' I then asked, 'Please describe them to me.' He said, 'Islam is to testify that no one deserves to be worshipped except Allah and to affirm the truthfulness of the Messenger of Allah. With it [Islam] lives are protected, marriages and inheritance become lawful and majority of people acknowledge this much. Belief is guidance and that which forms in the heart of the qualities of Islam and that which takes form from its practice. Belief is a degree higher than Islam. Belief is inclusive of Islam in appearance but Islam is not inclusive of belief esoterically

even though they may both apply to words and in description."[425]

Technically, a Munafiq who hides his kufr but professes Islam outwardly can marry a true Muslim.

Third, marriage between families and clans at that time bridges their differences and help warring factions sheath their swords. This was one of the political strategies the noble Prophet used to unite the ever-warring Arab society. Majority of Prophet's wives were political wives. This gave Islam more friends than open enemies. This is one of the wisdoms of marriage institution in Islam and society at large. This is the general reply to the Professor's main question. However, let us look at some of the examples he cited.

The Noble Prophet's Marriage with Aishah and Hafsah

The Professor writes:

From the beginning, "The Noble Prophet" has in laws, who then were his in-laws? His eleven wives were whose daughters? If you will disagree that not the whole of the in-laws were companions, then what of Aisha and Hafsah?

A lot have been said already pertaining to these two wives of the Prophet. Furthermore, there are too many controversies to the marriage of Bibi Aishah with the Prophet. From her first "marriage" with Jubayr ibn Mut'im, her age when she married the Prophet and the actual reason the Prophet got married to her.[426]

---

[425] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, Usul al-Kafi (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1427 H) [Bab al-Iman wa al-Kufr], vol. 2, pg. 19, chapter 15, Hadith #1

[426] Interestingly, there is a polemic Sunni hadith which even claims the marriage of Bibi Aisha and the noble Prophet had been solemnized in the heavens; and that Prophet used to dream of her. Sunni traditions even went as far as saying she was the only virgin and most beloved amongst the wives of the Prophet. All these are nothing but desperations to give virtues to Bibi Aisha. There is even an interpolation in the hadith of the four women leaders of Paradise. The name of Bibi Aisha suddenly

The bottomline is that marriage with the Prophet carries its virtues and high expectations. It is not an automatic passport to righteousness for either the woman or her family. In fact, it only carries political and societal status. The spiritual status it should carry is aligned to the personal efforts of individual [wife] in righteousness and fear of Allah. The case of Prophet Nuh and Prophet Lut's wives is given as a perfect example in Surah al-Tahrim where both women turned against their husband.[427] And pertaining to the wives of the noble Prophet [peace be upon him and his progeny] in general, Allah says:

.... يَا نِسَاءَ النَّبِيِّ لَسْتُنَّ كَأَحَدٍ مِّنَ النِّسَاءِ إِنِ اتَّقَيْتُنَّ

O wives of the Prophet! You are not like any other of the women; provided you are fearful (of Allah) ..."[428]

Prior to that, warning and glad tidings are also given:

يَا نِسَاءَ النَّبِيِّ مَن يَأْتِ مِنكُنَّ بِفَاحِشَةٍ مُّبَيِّنَةٍ يُضَاعَفْ لَهَا الْعَذَابُ ضِعْفَيْنِ وَكَانَ ذَٰلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يَسِيرًا

O wives of the prophet! Whoever of you commits an open indecency, the punishment shall be increased to her doubly; and this is easy to Allah.

وَمَن يَقْنُتْ مِنكُنَّ لِلَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَتَعْمَلْ صَالِحًا نُّؤْتِهَا أَجْرَهَا مَرَّتَيْنِ وَأَعْتَدْنَا لَهَا رِزْقًا كَرِيمًا

And whoever of you is obedient to Allah and His Apostle and does good, We will give to her reward doubly, and We have prepared for her an honorable sustenance.[429]

---

surfaced whereby after the Prophet has introduced the four women [leaders] of Paradise, he was allegedly said, "and the status of Aisha among women is like a particular Arabian food/soup to other foods."

[427] Surah al-Tahrim: 10

[428] Sura al-Ahzab: 32

[429] Sura al-Ahzab: 30 – 31

These noble verses will guide us to understand better what had been said in previous chapters about Bibi Aisha and Hazrat Hafsah.

Prophet's Daughters' Marriage

The Professor continues:

However, whom did he marry his daughters to? It is surprising that most of us are ignorant that the Prophet has four daughters whom he gave out for marriage. We all knew of his last daughter (Fatima). But the entire three daughters were married to the family of Banu Umayyad. Abu Asim bin Rabi'ah was his first son in-law that married his eldest daughter Zainab; he is a member of the Umayyad clan. ... The next two daughters i.e. Rukayya & Ummu Kulthum were married to Uthman radiyallahu Anhu separately. In the history of mankind, there is no any being that was privileged to marry two daughters of a Prophet but Uthman (R) a member of Umayyad. This gave him the name "Dhun Nurain" "Owner of two illuminate lights." This is because whoever married the daughter of a Prophet is blessed with "illuminate light" and Uthman Radiyallahu Anhu was blessed with two.

First, a clear fact is that none of these aforementioned "Prophet's daughters" was amongst his purified Ahl al-Bayt. History and authentic narration had it that Abu Bakr, Umar and other dignified Qurayshi men sought the hand of Hazrat Fatimah, the only female of the purified Ahl al-Bayt, in marriage but the noble Prophet did not grant their requests until Ali ibn Abi Talib made a proposal.

An-Nasa'I narrates:

Narrated 'Abdullah bin Buraidah:

أَخْبَرَنَا الْحُسَيْنُ بْنُ حُرَيْثٍ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا الْفَضْلُ بْنُ مُوسَى، عَنِ الْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ وَاقِدٍ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ بُرَيْدَةَ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، قَالَ خَطَبَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ وَعُمَرُ رضى الله عنهما فَاطِمَةَ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم " إِنَّهَا صَغِيرَةٌ " . فَخَطَبَهَا عَلِيٌّ فَزَوَّجَهَا مِنْهُ.

It was narrated from 'Abdullah bin Buraidah that his father said: "Abu Bakr and 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with them, proposed marriage to Fatimah but the Messenger of Allah said: 'She is young.' Then 'Ali proposed marriage to her and he married her to him."[430]

Grade: Sahih (authentic)

And who was Ali? He was the head of the Prophet's purified Ahl al-Bayt. Therefore, it was not a coincidence that other "daughters of the Prophet" were given out in marriage to other Muslim suitors mentioned by the professor while the case of Hadhrat Fatima was quite different.

Second, the status of the other three "daughters" of the Prophet is yet another controversial and heated topic among the historians. Apart from the popular view [that they were Prophet's biological daughters], some historians argued they were not the noble Prophet's biological children. It is said they were children of lady Khadijah from her previous marriage and the noble Prophet accepted them as his own just like he did to Zayd ibn Haritha who was popularly known and called by Zayd ibn Muhammad.[431] On the other hand, other historians argued that they were lady Khadijah's late sister's children. Obviously, there is no certainty on these controversial three opinions. However, the clearest point was that none of them was part of the Ahl al-Kisa.[432]

Lastly, our professor asked a question and erroneously answered it. He writes:

---

[430] Sunan an-Nasa'i 3221; In-book reference: Book 26, Hadith 26; English translation: Vol. 4, Book 26, Hadith 3223; https://sunnah.com/nasai:3221

[431] Until Allah reveals, "Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Apostle of Allah and the Last of the Prophets..." [Surah al-Ahzab: 40]

[432] Kindly see chapter 40

All the above aside, are you aware of the fact that Yazidu bin Mu'awiyya, who the Shi'ites accuse of assassinating Hussain is married to "Ahlulbait" i.e. Ummu kultum bint Abdullah bin Abbas bin Abdul-Mudalib, they had two issues i.e. namely Amru and Abdullahi?

Unfortunately, Yazid Ibn Mu'awiyah never had a wife by the name of "Ummu Kulthum bint Abdullah ibn Abbas ibn Abdul-Muttalib." That was the Professor's little fabrication or mistake. Yazid wives were: Umm Khalid Fakhita bint Abi Hisham and Umm kulthum bint Abdullah ibn AMR.[433]

MARRIAGE OF UMAR AND UMM KULTHUM BINT ALI IBN ABI TALIB

Question 53:

Why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, give his daughter in marriage to Umar bin Khattab? Are you not the ones who said he killed her mother while she was seeking her rights to inheritance? Or is that his reward for his evil deed?

Is your doctrine that Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu, is a bastard (an illegitimate child) true? Every Muslim detests this accusation against him during discussions and writings. You refer to him as an unbeliever and claim he is more devilish than the devil. Your scholar Ni'imatullah al-Jazairi reported that on the Day of Resurrection, the devil shall gaze at the painful torment of Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu! But why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, give him his daughter in marriage? Was it because her mother (Fatima) died? This union was reported in both your books and our books. Umm Kulthum, daughter of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, had two children with Umar, Radiyallahu Anhu: Zaid bin Umar and Ruqayyah bint Umar. These children are always proud of their lineage as descendants of two

---

[433] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, *Tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk* (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901), volume 19, pp.226 – 227 (The Caliphate of Yazid b. Mu'awiyah [The Number of Yazid b. Mu'awiyah's sons] – The Events of the Year 64).

caliphs; their father Umar was a caliph, and their grandfather is Ali, who is also a caliph.

If Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, was infallible, why did he give his daughter in marriage to an unbeliever? You must choose between these options: either believe that he is a believer, which undermines the basis of your creed, or accept that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, is not infallible, which would also unravel your creed.

THE REPLY

This is yet another controversial debate between the Shi'a and the Sunni. The sole aim of the Sunni is to establish that "there was no feud" between the Sunni first three Caliphs and Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib [on the issue of Caliphate] contrary to what the Shi'a used to say. However, some of the sincere Sunni Ulama will testify to the feuds between them but insist that they all resolved their differences and they will cite the example of Umm al-Kulthum bint [daughter of] Ali who got married to Umar ibn al-Khattab alongside other excuses.[434] It is imperative to examine various reports of both Sunni and Shi'ah on this "marriage;" only then can the truth behind the "marriage" be evident.

AHLU-SUNNAH'S STORY

Imam Muhammad ibn Sa'd [d. 230 H] writes:

أم كلثوم بنت علي بن أبي طالب بن عبد المطلب بن هاشم بن عبد مناف بن قصي وأمها فاطمة بنت رسول الله وأمها خديجة بنت خويلد بن أسد بن عبد العزى بن قصي تزوجها عمر بن الخطاب وهي جارية لم تبلغ فلم تزل عنده إلى أن قتل وولدت له زيد بن عمر ورقية بنت

---

[434] For example, that Ali participated in the war launched by Umar; that Ali was part of Umar's appointed executives etc. All these are fabrications. Read previous chapters for more expositions.

عمر ثم خلف على أم كلثوم بعد عمر عون بن جعفر بن أبي طالب بن عبد المطلب

Umm Kulthum bint Ali bin Abi Talib bin Abd al-Muttalib bin Hashem bin Abd Manaf bin Qusay, and her mother Fatima daughter of the Messenger of Allah and her mother Khadija bint Khuwaylid bin Asad bin Abdul-Uzzi bin Qusai. Umar bin Al-Khattab married her and she was a child who had not reached puberty, and she remained with him until he was killed and Zaid bin Umar was born to him and Ruqaya bint Umar, then Umm Kulthum married Aoun bin Jaafar bin Abi Talib bin Abdul Muttalib after Umar ...[435]

This is serious. But what exactly happened? Muhammad ibn Sa'd continues:

أخبرنا أنس بن عياض الليثي عن جعفر بن محمد عن أبيه أن عمر بن الخطاب خطب إلى علي بن أبي طالب ابنته أم كلثوم فقال علي إنما حبست بناتي على بني جعفر فقال عمر أنكحنيها يا علي فوالله ما على ظهر الأرض رجل يرصد من حسن صحابتها ما أرصد فقال علي قد فعلت

I was informed by Anas ibn 'Iyad al-Laythi, who reports on the authority of Ja'far ibn Muhammad [as-Sadiq], and he from his father [Muhammad al-Baqir] that:

'Umar ibn al-Khattab asked 'Ali ibn Abi Talib for the hand of Umm Kulthum in marriage. 'Ali said, "I had kept my daughters for the sons of Ja'far." 'Umar said, "Marry her to me, O Abul Hasan, for by Allah, there is no man on the face of the earth who seeks to achieve through her good

---

[435] Muhammad ibn Sad, *tabaqat al-Kubra* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji, 1st Edition, 1421 H)[annotator: Dr. Ali Muhammad Umar], vol. 10, pg. 429; No. 5463 [Umm al-Kulthum]

companionship that which I seek to achieve." 'Ali said, "I have done so..."[436]

Ibn Sa'd further documents:

قال محمد بن عمر وغيره لما خطب عمر بن الخطاب إلى علي ابنته أم كلثوم قال يا أمير المؤمنين إنها صبية فقال إنك والله ما بك ذلك ولكن قد علمنا ما بك فأمر علي بها فصنعت ثم أمر ببرد فطواه وقال انطلقي بهذا إلى أمير المؤمنين فقولي أرسلني أبي يقرئك السلام ويقول إن رضيت البرد فأمسكه وإن سخطته فرده فلما أتت عمر قال بارك الله فيك وفي أبيك قد رضينا قال فرجعت إلى أبيها فقالت ما نشر البرد ولا نظر إلا إلي فزوجها إياه فولدت له غلاما يقال له زيد

Muhammad ibn Umar and other than him said: Umar asked Imam Ali for the hand of Bibi Umme Kulthum (as) in marriage, to which Ali replied, 'O Commander of the Faithful, SHE IS A CHILD [not yet mature]. To which Umar replied, By Allah! That is not true. You are seeking to avoid me. Ali therefore ordered that Umm Kulthum have a bath and then wear a shawl. Ali told her to go to the Khalifa, give him my regards and ask him if he likes the shawl, he can keep it, other wise, he should return it. When she came to Umar, he said, May Allah bless you and your father, I like it. Hence Umm Kulthum came back to her father and told her that Umar did not open the shawl but just looked at me. Ali married her to Umar and they had a child named Zayd.[437]

Really? According to these reports so far, Ali "rejected" Umar's proposal on the following bases:

- Umm al-Kulthum had been kept for one of the sons of Ja'far
- She was a child, not yet attained the age of puberty

---

[436] Ibid
[437] Ibid

Interestingly, the story that follows Ali's initial "rejection" seemed contradictory to the reasons he laid down. However, Imam Dhahabi adds to the story that when Umm Kulthum gave the shawl to Umar:

وَوَضَعَ يَدَهُ عَلَى سَاقِهَا، فَكَشَفَهَا، فَقَالَتْ: أَتَفْعَلُ هَذَا؟ لَوْلاَ أَنَّكَ أَمِيْرُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ، لَكَسَرْتُ أَنْفَكَ. ثُمَّ مَضَتْ إِلَى أَبِيْهَا، فَأَخْبَرَتْهُ، وَقَالَتْ: بَعَثْتَنِي إِلَى شَيخ سُوءٍ! قَالَ: يَا بُنَيَّةُ! إِنَّهُ زَوْجُكِ.

And he [Umar] put his hand on her leg, and uncovered it. So, she [Umm al-Kulthum] said: Are you doing this? If you are not the Commander of the Faithful, I would have broken your nose. Then, she went to her father and told him what happened, and said: You sent me to an evil Sheikh [Old man]! He [Ali] said: O child! He is your husband.[438]

Hafiz Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi [d. 654 H] comments on this report thus:

وهذا قبيح والله لو كانت أمة لما فعل بها هذا. ثم باجماع المسلمين لا يجوز لمس الا جنبية فكيف ينسب عمر إلى هذا ...

And this is ugly, by Allah, [even] if it was a slave, he should not have done this to her. Then, according to the consensus of the Muslims, it is not permissible to touch anything except the janbiyyah; so how can Umar attribute to this![439]

It is crystal clear that the whole truth to this story was covered up and only scanty of information was left here and there. For a fact, there is more to the story. While few Shi'ah scholars [like Sheikh al-Mufid] denied the occurrence of the marriage, others argued that early historians mistook Umm al-Kulthum bint Abi Bakr for

---

[438] Shamsudeen Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Uthman ad-Dhahabi, *Siyar A'lam an-Nubala* (Beirut: Muasassat ar-Risalah; 1st Edition) [annotator: Shua'ib al-Ar'naut], vol. 3, pg. 501

[439] Abi al-Faraj Sibt ibn al-Jawzi, *Tadhkirat al-Khawaas* (Egypt: Maktab al-Iskandariyyah), pg. 321

Umm al-Kulthum bint Ali whom Imam Ali took into custody together with her mother [Asma bint Umays] and brother [Muhammad] after the death of her father, the first Caliph Abu Bakr. Even the Sunni Imam an-Nawawi in his Tahdhib al-Asma accepted an account in this regard. However, the Shi'a scholars who agreed with the occurrence of the story submit that the marriage was coerced with Umar using his veto power.

Sheikh Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni documents:

Muhammad ibn Abi Umayr – Hisham bin Salim – Abi Abd Allah [alayhi salam] said:

لما خطب اليه قال له أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: إنها صبية. قال : فلقي العباس فقال له: ما لي؟ ابي بأس؟ قال: وما ذاك؟

قال: خطبت إلى ابن اخيك فردني اما والله! لأعورن زمزم ولا ادع لكم مكرمة إلا هدمتها ولأقيمن عليه شاهدين بأنه سرق ولأقتعن يمينه. فأته العباس وسأله ان يجعل الأمر اليه فجعله اليه

'When Umar came to make the marriage proposal, the Commander of the Faithful, Ali (peace be upon him) told him: She is a child. Thereupon, Umar met Abbas and told him: What is wrong with me? Do I have any defect? Abbas said: Why are you saying that? Umar said: —I asked your nephew for his daughter 's hand in marriage, but he has turned me down. I swear by Allah! I will fill the well of Zamzam with earth, I will destroy every honor that you have, and I will set up two witnesses to testify that he stole, that I may cut off his right hand. 'Abbas thereupon came to Ali and informed him of what had transpired. He asked

Ali to put the matter in his hands, and Ali complied.[440] [441]

This shed light to Ali's passive reactions especially when her daughter narrated the ugly scene at the court of Umar ibn al-Khattab. Where is dignity in this kind of marriage if at all it ever took place?

It is worth noting according to other reports that after the death of Umar ibn al-Khattab, Imam Ali is reported to have gone to Umar's house and brought her daughter back to his house;[442] and eventually married her to Aoun ibn Ja'far,[443] [444] one of the sons of Ja'far whom he [Ali] has reserved her daughter for before Umar's threatened proposal.

CHILDREN OF ALI IBN ABI TAALIB

Question 54:

After the demise of Fatima, Radiyallahu Anha, Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, married many wives and had several children with them. My question will follow a very long detailed explanation from Shi'ite books. I will not provide the names of his wives and children from the Shi'ite sources: "Kashful Ghummah" and "Biharul Anwar" by Majlisi. They are as follows:

---

[440] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *Furu' al-Kafi* [Beirut: Manshuraat-ul-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H], Kitab an-Nikkah: [Chapter: Marriage of Umm al-Kulthum], vol. 5, p. 208, Hadith No. 2

[441] If one considers Umar's threat to burn the house of Fatima and its inhabitants – those sahabah who sought refuge in it to avoid giving Abu Bakr bay'ah – one will realize he was more than capable to carry out the threat.

[442] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *Furu' al-Kafi* [Beirut: Manshuraat-ul-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H], Kitab al-Talaq: Chapter 84, vol. 6, p. 75, Hadith No. 2

[443] See reference 12 and 13.

[444] Some historians [like the Sunni Imam Ibn Abd al-Barr] argued she Married Muhammad ibn Ja'far as Aoun ibn Ja'far was believed to had died before then.

He first married Ummul Banin, the daughter of Haramul Kalbi. Their children were Abbas, Ja'far, Abdullah, and Uthman.

He then married Laila from Mas'ud al-Tamimi; their children were Abdullah and Abu Bakr. All these children died with their brother Hussain at Karbala.

He married Asma'u bint Umais, one of the widows of Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu, after her widowhood.

Furthermore, Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, also married Umm Habiba from the family of Zam'atu. This union was a result of a jihad he fought under the leadership of Khalid bin Walid during the reign of Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu. She was part of his booty; he freed her and married her. Their children were Ruqayya and Umar. This Umar lived for 35 years.

Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, also married Khaulatu bint Ja'afar al-Hanafiyyah. This union occurred during the reign of Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu, and she was part of his booty from the "Ridda War." Unfortunately, the Shi'ites disagree with this situation as apostasy (Ridda); they always believe it was just a rebellion against the established authority. Whatever may be the case, Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, sacrificed his life for the success of this war. It was in this process that he was privileged to have Khaulah, and their child was Muhammad al-Akbar, popularly known as Ibn al-Hanafiyyah. Some sects of Shi'ites classify him among the infallible Imams.

Question: Why did Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, after the death of Fatima and during the reigns of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman, Radiyallahu Anhu, name his children after them? All these names were reported in your books mentioned earlier.

Why should Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, name his children after the enemies of Allah? Among all the Quraysh, Ali was the only person who named his children after these great companions (Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman). Is it because he loved them or otherwise?

THE REPLY

Before we give answer to the Professor's main question, it is very necessary to correct his fabrication. He writes:

Furthermore, Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu also marred Ummu Habiba from the family of Zam'atu this union was a result of a jihad he fought under the leadership of Khalid bin Walid during the reign of Abubakar Radiyallahu Anhu, she was part of his booties, he freed her & marry her. Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu also married Khaulatu bint Ja'afar AlHanafiyyah, this union was during the reign of Abubakar Radiyallahu Anhu and she was part of his booty of the "Ridda war." Unfortunately, the Shiite disconcur the situation as apostasy (Ridda) during that time they always believe that it was just a rebellion against the established authority. Whatever may be the case Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu sacrifice his life for the success of this war, it was in this process he was privilege to own Khaulah...

Our simple challenge to the Prof. is to bring an authentic narration [either from the Sunni or Shi'i source] to establish that Ali ibn Abi Taalib ever participated in any war fought during the time of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman?! Furthermore, it is an insult to the personality of Ali Ibn Abi Taalib, as the foremost of the believer, the best warrior of Islam and the bravest, that "...he fought under the leadership of Khalid bin Walid during the reign of Abubakar" as the Professor claimed.

WHO WAS KHALID IBN AL-WALID?

Khalid ibn Walid became a Muslim in the 6 A. H or 8 A. H having been an avowed enemy of Islam before his conversion. Even after becoming a Muslim, he never had a good credential. For example, Imam Muslim documents:

حَدَّثَنَا عُثْمَانُ بْنُ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ، حَدَّثَنَا جَرِيرٌ، عَنِ الأَعْمَشِ، عَنْ أَبِي صَالِحٍ، عَنْ أَبِي، سَعِيدٍ قَالَ كَانَ بَيْنَ خَالِدِ بْنِ الْوَلِيدِ وَبَيْنَ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ

بْنِ عَوْفٍ شَيْءٌ فَسَبَّهُ خَالِدٌ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لاَ تَسُبُّوا أَحَدًا مِنْ أَصْحَابِي فَإِنَّ أَحَدَكُمْ لَوْ أَنْفَقَ مِثْلَ أُحُدٍ ذَهَبًا مَا أَدْرَكَ مُدَّ أَحَدِهِمْ وَلاَ نَصِيفَهُ

Abu Sa'id reported there was some altercation between Khalid b. Walid and Abd al-Rahman b. Auf and Khalid reviled him. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) said: "Do not revile any of my sahabah; for if one amongst you were to spend as much gold as Uhud, it would not amount to as much as one mudd of one of them or half of it."[445]

Imam al-Bukhari also gives us a wealthy information about Khalid ibn Walid. He documents under "Chapter (35): If a judge passes an unjust judgement:"

حَدَّثَنَا مَحْمُودٌ، حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ، أَخْبَرَنَا مَعْمَرٌ، عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ، عَنْ سَالِمٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ عُمَرَ، بَعَثَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم خَالِدًا ح وَحَدَّثَنِي نُعَيْمٌ أَخْبَرَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ أَخْبَرَنَا مَعْمَرٌ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ عَنْ سَالِمٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ بَعَثَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم خَالِدَ بْنَ الْوَلِيدِ إِلَى بَنِي جَذِيمَةَ فَلَمْ يُحْسِنُوا أَنْ يَقُولُوا أَسْلَمْنَا. فَقَالُوا صَبَأْنَا صَبَأْنَا، فَجَعَلَ خَالِدٌ يَقْتُلُ وَيَأْسِرُ، وَدَفَعَ إِلَى كُلِّ رَجُلٍ مِنَّا أَسِيرَهُ، فَأَمَرَ كُلَّ رَجُلٍ مِنَّا أَنْ يَقْتُلَ أَسِيرَهُ، فَقُلْتُ وَاللَّهِ لاَ أَقْتُلُ أَسِيرِي وَلاَ يَقْتُلُ رَجُلٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِي أَسِيرَهُ. فَذَكَرْنَا ذَلِكَ لِلنَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَقَالَ: اللَّهُمَّ إِنِّي أَبْرَأُ إِلَيْكَ مِمَّا صَنَعَ خَالِدُ بْنُ الْوَلِيدِ، مَرَّتَيْنِ.

Narrated Ibn `Umar: The Prophet (peace be upon him) sent (an army unit under the command of) Khalid bin Al-Walid to fight against the tribe of Bani Jadhima and those people could not express themselves by saying, "Aslamna,"

---

[445] Sahih Muslim 2541 a; In-book reference : Book 44, Hadith 317; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 31, Hadith 6168 https://sunnah.com/muslim/44/317

but they said, "Saba'na! Saba'na! "Khalid kept on killing some of them and taking some others as captives, and he gave a captive to everyone of us and ordered everyone of us to kill his captive. I said, "By Allah, I shall not kill my captive and none of my companions shall kill his captive!" Then we mentioned that to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and he said, "O Allah! I am free from what Khalid bin Al-Walid has done," and repeated it twice."[446]

It is worth noting that ever since this ugly incident, the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) never sent Khalid ibn Walid to lead any army. Yet, some of the Ahlu Sunnah scholars claimed the Prophet gave Khalid a noble title of "Sayf Allah [sword of Allah]"?!

CASE OF THE BATTLE OF "RIDDA [APOSTACY]"

A group of Sahabah led by Malik ibn Nuwayrah refused to pay Zakat to the new Caliph Abu Bakr after the demise of the Prophet. Despite the fact that Umar disagreed with Abu Bakr to fight them, they were labelled as "mur'tads – apostates." Khalid Ibn Walid and his battalion were sent to these people.[447] Imam Ibn Abd al-Razzaq documents what happened. He documents:422

Abdulrazaq – Mu'amar – al'Zuhari –from- Abu-Qutadah said:

During Ridda (apostasy war), we marched to Ahl Abyaat and reached there at sunset, then we raised our spears, hence they asked: 'Who are you?' We replied: 'We are slaves of Allah.'

They said: 'We are slaves of Allah too.' Then Khalid arrested them and when it was morning, he ordered their beheading. Then I said: 'Oh Khalid! Fear Allah, this is not allowed for you.' He (Khalid) replied: 'Stay (back); this is

---

[446] Sahih al-Bukhari 7189; In-book reference : Book 93, Hadith 51; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 9, Book 89, Hadith 299; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/93/51

[447] Check chapter 39 for details.

not your business.' Then Abu Qutadah swore by Allah never to march with Khalid for any war. Qutadah said: 'The desert Arabs encouraged him (Khalid) on killing them for the sake of booties and that was Malik bin Nuwayrah's case.'

أخبرنا عبد الرزاق عن معمر عن الزهري أن أبا قتادة قال : خرجنا في الردة حتى إذا انتهينا إلى أهل أبيات ، حتى طلعت الشمس للغروب ، فأرشفنا إليهم الرماح ، فقالوا : من أنتم ؟ قلنا : نحن عباد الله ، فقالوا : ونحن عباد الله ، فأسرهم خالد بن الوليد ، حتى إذا أصبح أمر أن يضرب أعناقهم ، قال أبو قتادة : فقلت : اتق الله يا خالد ! فإن هذا لا يحل لك ، قال : اجلس ، فإن هذا ليس منك في شئ قال : فكان أبو قتادة يحلف لا يغزو مع خالد أبدا ، قال : وكان الاعراب هم الذين شجعوه على قتلهم من أجل الغنائم. وكان ذلك في مالك بن نويرة

After this massacre, Abu Bakr had to pay blood money for the killings of Malik ibn Nuwayrah and his people. If truly they were apostates, why would Abu Bakr pay blood money for their killing? Anyway, how is it possible for Ali ibn Abi Talib to be part of this battalion and not react as Abu Qatadah [and Abdullah ibn Umar as per other sources] did? Why would Ali be even part of Khalid ibn Walid's unit? For a fact, Ali was never part of Khalid ibn Walid's battalion at anytime.

MARRIAGE OF ALI WITH UMM HABIB AND KHAWLAH

Short Biography of Khawlah

She was from the tribe of Banu Hanifah, hence she was known as Hanafiyyah. When the people of Yamamah refused to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr; and they were declared "apostates" and some of them were massacred, she was taken captive among others. When her tribe came to know of this, they approached Ali ibn Abi Talib to save her and protect her dignity and family nobility. Ali finally

purchased her freedom, married her and Muhammad ibn Ali al-Hanafiyyah was born. She was a Sahabiyah [a female companion of the Prophet]. Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani writes about her:

خولة بنت إياس بن جعفر الحنفية والدة محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب رآها النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في منزله فضحك ثم قال يا علي أما إنك تتزوجها من بعدي وستلد لك غلاما فسمه باسمي وكنه بكنيتي وأنحله رويناه في فوائد أبي الحسن أحمد بن عثمان الأدمي من طريق إبراهيم بن عمر بن كيسان عن أبي جبير عن أبيه قنبر حاجب علي قال رآني علي فذكره وسنده ضعيف وثبوت صحبتها مع ذلك يتوقف على أنها كانت حينئذ مسلمة

Khawla bint Iyas bin Jaafar al-Hanafi, mother of Muhammad bin Ali bin Abi Talib, the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, saw her in his house, laughed, and then said, "O Ali, you should marry her after me and (she will) give birth to a boy" Named him by my name and by my nickname." We narrated it in the fawaid of Abi Al-Hassan Ahmad bin Uthman Al-Adami through Ibrahim bin Omar bin Kaysan on the authority of Abi Jubayr on the authority of his father Qanbar Hajib Ali, who said Ali saw me, and he mentioned it; and its chain of transmission is weak, and the proof of her companionship, however, depends on the fact that she was then [at the lifetime of the Prophet] a Muslima.[448]

Short Biography of Umm Habib

Imam Jarir Tabari writes about her:

---

[448] Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Alamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1415) [annotator: Adil Ahmad Abd al-Mawjud and Ali Muhammad Muawadh], kitab an-Nisa/Har'f al-Khaa', vol. 8, pg. 113, no. 11114.

From the woman called al-Sahba' (who was Umm Habib bint Rabi'ah b. Bujayr b. al-'Abd b. Alqamah b al-Harith b. Utbah b. Sa'd b. Zuhayr b. jusham b. Bakr b. Hubayb b. 'Amr b. Ghanam b. Taghlib b. Wa'il; she was a concubine from among the captives taken by Khalid b. al-Walid when he raided the Bani Taghlib at 'Ayn al-Tamr) 'Ali was father of 'Umar and Ruqayyah. Umar b. 'All was granted eighty-five years of life, having a half share of 'Ali's inheritance and dying at Yanbu'[449]

HIS MAIN QUESTION

The Professor finally states his main question as he writes:

Why did Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu after the death of Fatima, and during the reign of Abubakar, Umar & Uthman Radiyallahu Anhu named his children with their names? All these names were reported in your books mentioned earlier...

First, we must stress that there is absolutely nothing wrong with the names "Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman." They were common names bore by lots of people at the lifetime of the Prophet, and after his demise. Therefore, if Ali decided to name his children with these beautiful names, then what is the hullaballoo?

Second, "Abu Bakr" is not a name but a nickname. However, it is only in the imagination of some Ahlu Sunnah like our Professor that the names "Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman" were only bear by the first three Caliphs. Hence, his thought was, for

Ali to have named his children with these names, then he must have named them after the first three Caliphs. Then, the onus lies on the shoulder of the Professor to give us

---

[449] Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, *Tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk* (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901) [translated and annotated by G. R Hawting], volume 17, pp.228 (The First civl war [His (Ali's) wives and children] – The Events of the Year 40).

authentic narration where Ali confirmed that he named his children after the Caliphs.

Third, the real name of the first Caliph was Abdullah ibn Abi Quhafah. His nickname was "Abu Bakr." Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his prestigious book al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah exposed another sahabah who also bore the nickname: Makythu al-Juhany Awrd'h Abu Bakr bin Ubay. He narrated from the Prophet as documented by Imam Ibn Abd al-Razzaq in his al-Musannaf.[450]

Furthermore, apart from the second Caliph [Umar ibn al-Khattab], other sahabah like: Umar ibn Abi Salamah,[451] he was the governor of Fars for Ali ibn Abi Talib during his reign. Umar was trained in the house of the Prophet and he and her mother Umm Salamah [the beloved wife of the Prophet] were real lovers of Ahl al-Bayt. Therefore, if we conclude that Imam Ali named one of his sons after Umar ibn Abi Salamah, have we said too much?!

Lastly, there were Uthman b. Maz'un (d. 3 A. H),[452] Uthman b. Hunayf al-Awsi al-Ansari [Abu 'Amr][453]. He was Imam Ali's governor in Basra at the beginning of his reign, and among the Shurtat al-Khamis [group of devoted fighters who had dedicated their lives to support Ali ibn Abi Talib]. In fact, Shi'a have authentic narrations that Imam Ali named one of his sons after him.

CHANGING OF NAMES

Question 55:

Why, when and where was the origin of this your innovation of changing names while your earlier scholars

---

[450] Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Alamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1415) [annotator: Adil Ahmad Abd al-Mawjud and Ali Muhammad Muawadh]

[451] Ibid

[452] Ibid

[453] Ibid

have those names and didn't change them? Let's analyze your most holy book i.e. "Al-Kafi," the introduction can suffice to see the narrators of the acclaimed knowledge of "Ahlulbait."

The names of some scholars are as follows; Mufaddal bin Umar, Ahmad bin Umar Al-Halabi, Umar bin Aban, Umar bin Uzainah, Umar bin Hanzalah, Musa bin Umar, Abbas bin Umar. Why didn't your earlier scholars change their names? But you change yours? From the initial stage, were these names because of love or hatred of Umar?

THE REPLY

As rightly observed by the Professor, there were lots of Shi'ah of the past bearing the names "Umar, Uthman" and even "Mu'awiyah and Yazid." As we have proven earlier that these were common Arab names and are not monopoly of "those notable companions" as some ignorants want us to believe. However, if anyone thinks or argues that those past Shi'ah were named after Umar ibn al-Khattab, Uthman ibn Affan, Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan, then the onus is on him to provide authentic evidence to support such claim.

Futhermore, there were some Sunnis bearing the abovementioned names, who later became Shi'ah [from history and present]; some retained their names and others chose to change their names to the name of a particular member of the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt in order to apparently express the fire of Ahl al-Bayt's love burning in them. Is there a problem in this?!

MARRIAGES OF ALI

Question 56:

All the religious wars that were fought during Abubakar, Umar and Uthman were regarded as brutal and tyrannical by the Shi'ites. Why did Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu make sexual union with the women prisoners that were alotted to him as part of his booties going by your claim that those

wars were tyrannical and brutal wars? Why should he then have sexual relation with those women?

REPLY

This question has been answered and treated under question 54. However, additional question to the Professor and his followers is that did Ali ibn Abi Talib make illegal sexual relation with those women when he writes in his question "Why did Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu make sexual union with the women prisoners...?"

CHAPTER FOURTY

CALIPH ABU BAKR, HAZRAT FATIMA AND FADAK

From question 57 till question question 63, the Professor focused on the issue of fadak painting one single question with different colors. Therefore, on this chapter, we shall bring all the questions together and give a single reply.

Question 57:

You, the Shi'ites, accuse Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu, of denying Fatima, Radiyallahu Anha, her inheritance. You claim that she was denied her right to inheritance by Abu Bakr, Radiyallahu Anhu, and that she always cried by the grave of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, saying, "Oh Prophet of Allah, I forward my grievances to you!" Our question here is: Abu Bakr denied whose wife her inheritance? Is Ali not nicknamed the King of the Lions? Is he not the leader of warriors and bravery? Why didn't he do something in her favor? If what you claim about the miscarriage is true, how can one comprehend it?

Question 58:

Or is it a revenge that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, took by later marrying the widow of Abu Bakr? They even had a child together named Muhammad, who was nursed and brought up by Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu. He was even appointed as Governor by Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu.

Question 59:

The garden of Fadak—was it a gift or an inheritance? If it is a gift, why was Zainab denied? Umm Kulthum was also alive; she survived for three years after Khaybar (i.e., nine years after Hijra), almost until the death of the Prophet. Why was Fatima given this alone?

Was it not the Noble Prophet who told Bushair bin Sa'ed when he wanted the Prophet to bear witness to a gift for his son: "Do you have other children?" He replied, "Yes." The Prophet then asked, "Have you given them the same type of gift?" He replied, "No." The Prophet said, "I don't bear unjust witness (evidence)" (Sahih al-Bukhari 2456 & Muslim 3058).

Question 60:

If your answer to the above question is that the garden is a gift, then was it taken away from her possession? Or was it not in her possession and she wanted it to be given to her? Because the Islamic principle of "hiba" (gift) must be under the possession of the donee before the death of the donor. If there is no possession and the donor dies, the gift automatically reverts back to the donor; thus, the gift becomes void.

But if it is an inheritance and not a gift, then he has other heirs who have rights to inheritance. Have you forgotten Abbas, a paternal uncle who is a residual heir to the Noble Prophet and would exclude Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, as a paternal uncle's son under the rules of exclusion?

Question 61:

What then was the story of this garden during the reigns of the three leaders? If it was Fatima's right (inheritance), then during the time/reign of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, he should have executed the property to its rightful owners—i.e., himself and his children as inheritance. But nothing like that was narrated. Then what is the origin of your myth?

Question 62:

It was narrated in your books that females don't inherit landed properties or land in general. In the book "Al-Kafi fil Furu'i" (7/127), there is a chapter titled "Females Are Not Entitled to Inherit Any Landed Property." He brought

a narration from Abu Abdullah who was asked: "What are women/females entitled to as inheritance?"

He replied: "They are given the monetary worth of sand, buildings, and trees; but land and farms—etc.—they have nothing to inherit."

Our question is: why did Fatima, Radiyallahu Anha, request for a void right? Tusi also reported this narration in "Al-Tahzib" (9/254).

Question 63:

In your narrations you said: "Whatever belongs to a Prophet after his demise has become the property of an Imam (leader)." It was narrated in "Al-Kafi," Kitabul Hujja (1/476). Why did Fatima also claim Imam's property? Abu Bakr was the Imam. You will respond negatively; then why didn't Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu claim and request his property?

THE REPLY

In the introduction to this book, we have written the following:

In fact, Imam al-Bukhari later documented that it took Ali ibn Abi Taalib six months before he could pay allegiance to the first Caliph Abu Bakr, and even the allegiance was paid only when he discovered people's animosity towards him after the death of his beloved wife Faatimah, the daughter of the Prophet, who also left the world without recognising the leadership of Abu Bakr and refused to talk to him till she passed. Few athar claimed she got angry at Abu Bakr when the later refused to grant her wish by not giving her a piece of land that belonged to her father. The Caliph was reported to have said, "I heard the Prophet who said no one inherit we the Prophet. Whatever we leave goes into charity". Could this be what truly angered Bibi Faatimah, the Doyen of all the believing women that she refused to talk to the Caliph till her death? Why would "a piece of land" anger Faatimah (peace be upon her) to such extent of not giving allegiance to the Caliph of her time; yet, the Prophet said in a popular hadith, "whoever dies without paying allegiance to the Imam of his time dies the death of the age of ignorance"?! What is reasonable even without going deep into history is that Faatimah never recognised Abu Bakr as the rightful successor of the Prophet; otherwise, we will have to settle with the second option that she died a Kaafir (unbeliever) going by the abovementioned hadith. This is the bitter truth some hadith collectors and certain historians cannot live with; hence, the need to paint the whole scene as "land related issue" in their report not minding the consequences.

The land of fadak was a vast fertile land that was under the control and administration of the Prophet; although, it was Prophet's personal property yet the productivity of the land was part of the main source of income for the Islamic state. A Khalifah is known as al-Mutawali lil Umur – one who controls the affairs; therefore, it is logical for Bibi Fatimah to "fight" using one of the most important properties of the Islamic state to prove that Abu Bakr usurped the position of Khilafah from the Ahl al-Bayt. Had the land was given to Fatimah vis-à-vis the Ahl al-Bayt, Abu Bakr's khilafa-ship [control of affairs] would have been weakened.

THE GENESIS

Imam Bukhari documents:

Narrated `Aisha: Fatima the daughter of the Prophet (peace be upon him) sent someone to Abu Bakr (when he was a caliph), asking for her inheritance of what Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) had left of the property bestowed on him by Allah from the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) in Medina, and Fadak, and what remained of the Khumus of the Khaibar booty. On that, Abu Bakr said, "Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) said, "Our property is not inherited. Whatever we leave, is Sadaqa, but the family of (the Prophet) Muhammad can eat of this property. By Allah, I will not make any change in the state of the Sadaqa of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and will leave it as it was during the lifetime of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him), and will dispose of it as Allah's Messenger peace be upon him) used to do." So Abu Bakr refused to give anything of that to Fatima. So she became angry with Abu Bakr and kept away from him, and did not talk to him till she died. She remained alive for six months after the death of the Prophet. When she died, her husband `Ali, buried her at night without informing Abu Bakr and he said the funeral prayer by himself. When Fatima was alive, the people used to respect `Ali much, but after her death, `Ali noticed a change in the people's attitude towards him. So `Ali sought reconciliation with Abu Bakr and gave him an oath of allegiance. `Ali had not given the oath of allegiance during

those months (i.e. the period between the Prophet's-death-and-Fatima's-death) ...."[454]

Imam Muslim also documents [455]:

It has been narrated by Urwa b Zubair on the authority of Aisha, wife of the Prophet (peace be upon him), that Fatima, daughter of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), requested Abu Bakr, after the death of the Messenger of Allah (may peace he upon him), that he should set apart her share from what the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) had left from the properties that God had bestowed upon him. Abu Bakr said to her: 'The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: "We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is Sadaqa (charity)." The narrator said: She (Fatima) lived six months after the death of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and she used to demand from Abu Bakr her share from the legacy of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) from Khaibar, Fadak and his charitable endowments at Medina. Abu Bakr refused to give her this, and said: I am not going to give up doing anything which the Messenger of Allah used to do. I am afraid that if I go against his instructions in any matter I shall deviate from the right course. So far as the charitable endowments at Medina were concerned, 'Umar handed them over to 'Ali and Abbas, but 'Ali got the better of him (and kept the property under his exclusive possession). And as far as Khaibar and Fadak were concerned 'Umar kept them with him, and said: These are the endowments of the Messenger of Allah to the Umma). Their income was spent on the discharge of the responsibilities that devolved upon him on the emergencies he had to meet. And their management was to be in the hands of one who managed the affairs (of the Islamic

---

[454] Sahih al-Bukhari 4240, 4241; In-book reference: Book 64, Hadith 278; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 546; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/64/278

[455] Sahih Muslim 1759 c; In-book reference: Book 32, Hadith 63; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 19, Hadith 4354; https://sunnah.com/muslim/32/63

State). The narrator said: They have been managed as such up to this day."

From the above narrations, following are gathered in a nutshell:

1. Hadhrat Fatima approached Khalifa Abu Bakar after the demise of her beloved father demanding the share of inheritance left by her father, the holy Prophet: Inheritance from the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) in Medina, and Fadak and what remained of the Khumus of the Khaibar booty.
2. The Khalifa quoted a "hadith" to lady Fatima. This narration is ascribed to the Prophet by the Khalifa and it says, "Our (the Prophets) property is not inherited. Whatever we leave is Sadaqa". Therefore, the Khalifa did not grant the request of Hadhrat Fatima.
3. This does not augur well with Hadhrat Fatima and she became so angry that she refused to speak with the Khalifa until her death six months after. Interestingly, she was persistent in her request as we read in Imam Muslim's document:

"...She (Fatima) lived six months after the death of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and she used to demand from Abu Bakr her share from the legacy of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) from Khaibar, Fadak and his charitable endowments at Medina..."[456]

And this is consistent when we realized that Bibi Fatima "asked (meaning: went herself to)" the Khalifa Abu Bakar. At another time, she sent "someone"[457] to the Khalifah

---

[456] Sahih Muslim 1759 c; In-book reference: Book 32, Hadith 63; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Book 19, Hadith 435; https://www.sunnah.com/muslim/32/6

[457] The "someone" is believed to be Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib, Bibi Fatima's husband. It is established in the book of ahadith that Umm al-mumineen Aisha is aversed to mentioning the name "Ali ibn Abi Talib." {(For example: *Musnad* of Ahmad bin Hanbal, Volume 6, page 228 Tradition 25956 www.islamport.com/d/1/mtn/1/89/3525.html

and yet, at another time, she and Al-Abbas[458] went to the Khalifah.

4. And it seemed her anger had "influence" on her husband, Hadhrat Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib who buried her secretly when she died without informing the Khalifah.
5. Ali later realized people's cold attitudes towards him and decided to "reconcile" with the Khalifah Abubakar whom he had not given the oath of allegiance to for the past six months. Obviously, his wife, lady Fatima never gave allegiance to the Khalifah (also) till her death.
6. After the reign of the first Khalifah, and the assumption of power of the second Khalifah, Umar ibn al-Khattab, a share of Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) in Medina tagged "charitable endowment" was given to Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib and Hazrat Al-Abbas, and Ali ibn Abi Talib kept it in his own possession ahead of Al-Abbas who later dimmed Ali as "liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest"[459] as a result of that.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Every objective reader will not find it difficult to see the one-sidedness of the story. Again, Bibi Fatima and her husband Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib were poorly and unjustly presented. They were pictured to look guilty. This alone challenges their status as regards verse of purification where Allah has purified them absolutely from al-Rijz [all form of physical and spiritual blemishes]. Going by this

---

[458] Sahih al-Bukhari 6725, 6726; In-book reference: Book 85, Hadith 3; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 8, Book 80, Hadith 718; https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/85/3

[459] See: chapter Twenty Nine (29) and note 3 under it for details.

story via different versions, several fundamental questions come to mind:

- Were possessions of Prophets of God not inherited materially and spiritually?
- Why did Bibi Fatima persist in her request after a "hadith" of her father was related to her?
- Was her demand really worth it to the extent that she became angry at the Khalifah of her time, refused to pay allegiance to him, and never talked to him for six months till her death and was buried secretly?
- Why did Ali ibn Abi Talib, who was adjudged as the best judge of the Ummah[460] and the most knowledgeable of the Quran and Sunnah[461] and the most ascetic of the Ummah[462], support his wife till her death (despite hearing the "hadith" also), and refused to pay allegiance to the Khalifah (at least for six months) and dimmed him (Khalifah Abubakar) "liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest"?
- Why did Ali ibn Abi Talib take over the share of Fai (i.e. Booty gained without fighting) in Medina tagged "charitable endowment" that was entrusted to him and Al-Abbas by the Khalifa Umar to be administered as the Prophet used to, as his own exclusive possession? Wasn't that treachery?

INVESTIGATION

---

[460] Sahih Bukhari USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 6, Book 60, Hadith 8; Arabic reference: Book 65, Hadith 4481; https://sunnah.com/urn/41630

[461] Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem* (Dar al-Taybah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi; 2nd edition, 1420H), [annotator: Sami b. Muhammad Salamah], vol. 7, pg. 413; Ahmad b. Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Musnad* (Cairo: Muasassat Qurtubah) [annotator: Shuayb al-Arnaut], vol. 5, p. 26, #20322; vol. 1, p. 199, #1720

[462] Al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain* (Beirut: Dar al-kutub al-'Ilmiyah; 1st edition 1411H)[annotator: Musfata Abd al-Qadr Ata], vol. 3, p. 571, #6121

Like we have said earlier, whoever read the story objectively will easily notice how one-sided it is. While the two major actors (first and second Khalifah) in the story are absolved of any fault, Bibi Fatima and Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib were indirectly painted with faults. However, questions in our observations (above) suggest the story could be more than that and that the narrators (of the two sahih) probably reported and documented what suit them. In sha Allah, we intend to give more details of the story via other reliable sources.

If Hadhrat Fatima and Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib were guilty of the observations we have highlighted above, then one will have no choice but to question the veracity of:

- Ayat at-tatheer – verse of purification – with respect to them, where Allah, the Most High has purify them absolutely of whatever blemishes
- Concluding part of hadith thaqalayn where the Prophet says "...they (ahl al-bayt and the Quran) will NEVER separate from each other till Qiyamat."

These two references point to the fact that the Ahl al-bayt can only do what is consistent with purity and with the Quran. This is the shortest investigation and response in defense of the Ahl al-bayt (especially Bibi Fatima and Imam Ali) with respect to this one-sided story. We however, intend to go further by answering questions we have raised in our observation.

WERE PROPHETS OF GOD NOT INHERITED, MATERIALLY AND SPIRITUALLY?

This is one area of an agelong debate between the Sunni and the Shia schools especially on the issue of fadak. On one hand, Shia school are of the opinion that Prophets were inherited, materially and spiritually by their heirs and family. This, according to Shi'i school, is supported by two verses in the noble Qur'an where Allah says:

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُودَ And Sulaiman was Dawud's heir[463]

Also, Prophet Zakariyyah requested from Allah, a son; and was quoted to have said:

وَإِنِّي خِفْتُ الْمَوَالِيَ مِن وَرَائِي وَكَانَتِ امْرَأَتِي عَاقِرًا فَهَبْ لِي مِن لَّدُنكَ وَلِيًّا

And surely, I fear my cousins after me, and my wife is barren, therefore grant me from Thyself an heir.

يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوبَ وَاجْعَلْهُ رَبِّ رَضِيًّا

Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub, and make him, my Lord, one in whom Thou art well pleased.[464]

Sunni school, on the other hand, are of the opinion based on the influence of the "hadith" stated in the above story – {"Our (the Prophets) property is not inherited. Whatever we leave, is Sadaqa", "We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is Sadaqa (charity)"} that the inheritance being talked about in the above two verses are not material (like wealth, land, kingdom and so on) but spiritual (like Prophethood, wisdom, and knowledge). Of course, Shia school do not believe in the hadith (which states that properties of the Prophets are not inherited by their heirs). Rather, Shia schools believe both material and spiritual possessions and properties of Prophets were inherited by their heirs. This seems to answer the second question of why hadhrat Fatima was persistent in her request despite the "hadith" being read to her by the Khalifah. Although her persistence is much greater in purpose than the "material" demand. In sha Allah, we shall return to this in detail.

FADAK WAS A GIFT AND NOT PART OF INHERITANCE LEFT BY THE PROPHET

Narrated `Aisha:

---

[463] Surah An-Naml, Verse 16
[464] Surah Maryam, Verse 5 - 6

Fatima the daughter of the Prophet (peace be upon him) sent someone to Abu Bakr (when he was a caliph), asking for her inheritance of what Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) had left of the property bestowed on him by Allah from the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) in Medina, and Fadak, and what remained of the Khumus of the Khaibar booty. On that, Abu Bakr said, "Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) said, "Our property is not inherited. Whatever we leave, is Sadaqa..."

First, the narrator of this report never quoted a single word directly from [the mouth of] Hazrat Fatima. Therefore, it is not appropriate to insinuate that Hazrat Fatima asked for inheritance of what Allah's Messenger had left of the property of Fadak when the land of Fadak had been appropriated to her as a gift during the lifetime of her father, the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessing be upon him and his progeny.

We read in the holy Quran:

وَآتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ وَالْمِسْكِينَ وَابْنَ السَّبِيلِ وَلَا تُبَذِّرْ تَبْذِيرًا

And give to the near of kin his due and (to) the needy and the wayfarer, and do not squander wastefully.[465]

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir documents under this ayah:

تفسير القرآن العظيم » تفسير سورة الإسراء

وقال الحافظ أبو بكر البزار حدثنا عباد بن يعقوب حدثنا أبو يحي التيمي حدثنا فضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية

عن أبي سعيد قال لما نزلت هذه الآية (وآت ذا القربى حقه) دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاطمة

فأعطاها فدك

---

[465] Surah Al-Isra, Verse 26

And al-Hafiz Abubakar al-Busara said: Narrated to us Ibaada ibn Yaquub, narrated Abu Yahya al-Thaymi, narrated Fudayl ibn Marzuq from Atiya from Abi Saed who said: When this ayah was revealed (And give to the near of kin his due), Messenger of Allah, Peace be upon him, call Fatima and gave her Fadak ...

Then, Ibn Kathir writes under the hadith:

وهذا الحديث مشكل لو صح إسناده لأن الآية مكية ، و فدك إنما فتحت مع خيبر سنة سبع من الهجرة فكيف يلتئم هذا مع هذا

And this hadith is a problem if its chain is authentic because the verse is Makkan (that is, was revealed in Makkah), and Fadak with Khaybar was conquered in the 7th Hijrah (in Madina). So, how could that be?[466]

Of course, al-Hafiz ibn Kathir seemed to believe in the authenticity of the report otherwise he would have exposed its weakness first before stating his question.

Imam Abi Ya'la also documents similar hadith in his Musnad and at the footnote, following is written:

إسناده ضعيف لضعف عطية وذكره الهيثمى في (مجمع الزوائد 49/7 وقال: رواه الطبرانى وفيه العوفى وهو متروك) وفاته ان ينسبه الى أبي يعلى.

Its chains is weak due to the weakness of Atiya. Al-Haythami has mentioned it (7/49) and said: "Narrated Al-Tabarani and in it there is Atiya Al-Awfi, and he is

---

[466] Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem (Dar Taybat; Published year: 1422 A.H), under verse 26 of sura al-Israi; http://library.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?idfrom=1007&idto=1007&bk_no=49&ID=1026

Matrook (rejected)" and he has forgotten to mention it through Abi Ya'la too.[467]

Interestingly, there is absolutely nothing alarming with Atiya to the point of weakening his hadith as this annotator wants to hoodwink us. Following are few comments about Atiya:

Imam Ibn Sa'd writes:

عطية بن سعد

ابن جنادة العوفى ... وكان ثقة إن شاء الله وله أحاديث صالحة

ومن الناس من لا يحتج به.

Atiya ibn Sa'd ibn Junada Al-Awfi from the tribe of Qays and his title was Abal Hassan. ... And he was trustworthy Insha Allah, and he has good narrations and some people do not cite him.[468]

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani also writes about him:

عطية {بن سعد} بن جنادة ... العوفى الجدلى ... الكوفي أبو الحسن

صدوق يخطىء كثيرا وكان شيعيا مدلسا من الثالثة مات سنة إحدى عشرة

Atiya ibn Sa'd ibn Junada, Al-Awfi Al-Jadali, Al-Kufi, Abul Hassan, he is truthful, he used to make mistakes

---

[467] Ahmad ibn Ali Ibn al-Muthana at-Tamimi, *Musnad Abi Ya'la* (Beirut: Dar al-Mamun Li-Turath, 2nd Edition) [annotator: Husayn Salim Asad], vol. 2, p. 334, under hadith no. 1075 (101)

[468] Muhammad Ibn Sa'd, *Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kubra* (Cairo: al-Nashr Maktaba al-Khanji, 1st Edition, 1421)[annotator: Ali Muhammad Umar], vol. 8, pg. 421, No. 3202

much. And he was Shi'a and Mudallis. He is of the 8th generation. He died in the year 111 A.H.[469]

Obviously, since Atiya did not commit tadlis in the abovementioned report and is generally adjudged as truthful, then the report is hasan (good). Of course, aqeedah (belief) of a narrator is never used to discredit his hadith; Atiya, being a Shi'a does not affect his report.

Alongside al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, Imam Mahmud Alusi (d. 1270 H) also writes under the same ayah in his Tafsir:

وأخرج ابن جرير عن علي بن الحسين رضي الله تعالى عنهما أنه قال لرجل من أهل الشام: أقرأت القرآن؟ قال: نعم. قال: أفما قرأت في بني إسرائيل: فآت ذا القربى حقه ؟ قال: وإنكم القرابة الذي أمر الله تعالى أن يؤتى حقه؟ قال: نعم.

ورواه الشيعة عن الصادق رضي الله تعالى عنه، وحقهم توقيرهم وإعطاؤهم الخمس.

وضعف بأنه لا قرينة على التخصيص، وأجيب بأن الخطاب قرينة وفيه نظر.

وما أخرجه البزار وأبو يعلى وابن أبي حاتم وابن مردويه عن أبي سعيد الخدري من أنه لما نزلت هذه الآية دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاطمة فأعطاها فدكا.

لا يدل على تخصيص الخطاب به عليه الصلاة والسلام على أن القلب من صحة الخبر شيء بناء على أن السورة مكية وليست هذه الآية من

---

[469] Ahmad ibn Ali Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *Taqreeb Al-Tahdheeb* (Dar al-'Asima li-Nashr wa Tawzih)[Ahmad Shaghif al-Pakistani], pg. 680, No. 4649

المستثنيات وفدك لم تكن إذ ذاك تحت تصرف رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، بل طلبها رضي الله تعالى عنها ذلك إرثا بعد وفاته عليه الصلاة والسلام كما هو المشهور يأبى القول [ص: 63] بالصحة كما لا يخفى.

Ibn Jarir - Ali ibn al-Husein (grandson of Fatima) - God please with them both - who said to a man from people of Sham (Syria): Do you read Quran? He (the man) said: Yes. He (Ali ibn Husain) said: Have you not read in (sura) Bani Israil: And give the nearest of kin his due? He (the man) said: And are you (from among) the nearest of kin that Allah the most High commanded that his due be given? He (Ali ibn Husain) said: Yes. And the Shia report from (Imam) Sadiq - Allah be please with him – "And their right is to be revered and Khums be given to them."

The report [from Imam Sadiq which says that their right is "to respect and give them Khums"] is considered weak because there is no supportive evidence to back up this claim (particularization). Then I respond saying that the statement itself is supportive evidence to that. And what has been narrated by Al-Bazzar, Abu Ya'la, ibn Abi Hatam and ibn Mar'dawaih from Abi Sa'eed Al-Khudri that when this verse was revealed, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) called Faatima and gave her the Fadak, does not confine in addressing to him (peace be upon him), because there is something in my heart about the authenticity of this narration, based on the fact that this Surah is Makkan and this verse is not of the exceptions (i.e. of being a Madani verse) and Fadak was not under the Messenger of Allah's (peace be upon him) control at that time, rather she (Fatima) asked for it as her inheritance after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him), as it is famous."[470]

---

[470] Shaab al-Din as-Sayiid Mahmud al-Alusi, *Ruhu al-Maani fi Tafsir al-Quran* (Ihyaa al-Turat al-Arabi); Vol. 15, Pg. # 62.

In short, both al-Hafiz ibn Kathir and Imam Mahmud Alusi considered the report as authentic but what seemed to be their objection to this report (that Prophet gave Fadak to Fatima following the revelation of Q.17: 26) was the fact that the ayah (verse) was revealed in Makkah while Fadak was not in Prophet's possession at that time.

Indeed, the report is a big threat to the Ahlu Sunnah's arguments about the issue of Hadhrat Fatima demanding her right from the Khalifah Abu Bakr after the demise of the Prophet. If Ahlu Sunnah failed to cast doubt on the report, then Khalifah Abu Bakr will be exposed and guilty of confiscating the right of Bibi Fatima.

Apart from the fact that both Ibn Kathir and Imam Alusi knew vividly well that there are verses revealed with future effects, Imam Alusi seemed to have forgotten that he himself documented that the verse (17: 26) was exceptionally revealed in Madina while some reports say it was revealed twice (one in Makkah, and later in Madina). Imam Alusi in the introductory part of sura al-Israi in his Tafsir writes:

"Surah 17, the Bani Israeel. It is also called Al-Asraa and Subhan too. And this Surah is Makkan according to what ibn Mardawaih has narrated from ibn Abbas and ibn Al-Zubayr, and being Makkan in its entire form is also the opinion of the majority. And the author of Al-Ghanyan has said that there is consensus on this, it is said though that with the exception of the two verses: "And surely they had purposed to turn you away..."{17:73} and "And surely they purposed to unsettle..."{17:76} and it is said except the following four verses: The previous two verses and the verse "And when We said to you: Surely your Lord encompasses men..." {17:60} and "And say: My Lord! Make me to enter a goodly entering..." {17:60}, and Maqatil has added this verse too: "Surely those who are given the knowledge before..." {17:107} and Al-Hasan* has said that except the following five verses of it: "And do not kill any one whom..." {17:33} and "And go not nigh to fornication..." {17:33} and "Those whom they call upon..." {17:57} and "Keep up prayer" {17:78} and "And

give to the near of kin his due" {17:26}, and Qatada has said that except eight verses: and that is the verse "And surely they had purposed to turn you away" {17:73} up to the end, and there are also other opinions."[471]

This clearly proved that verse (17:26) [And give the nearest of kinsmen his due] primarily commanded the holy Prophet, and he in turn abided by the command by giving his nearest of kinsmen – Fatima – her due (Fadak, when or after it was conquered). This right is automatically passed down the lineage of Fatima; hence, the claim of Ali ibn al-Husein (Imam Zaynul al-abideen) and Jafar ibn Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussain (Imam Jafar as-Sadiq) as documented by the Sunni Imam Mahmud al-Alusi (above) among others. In short, Hazrat Fatima's demand was fadak (which was confiscated) alongside other inheritance (share of khaybar, Madina etc) left by her father, the Prophet.

HAZRAT FATIMA'S DEMAND AND PROTEST OF HER (OTHER) INHERITANCE

Of course, the response of the first Khalifah Abu Bakr to Hazrat Fatima's demand was an "hadith" which allegedly quoted the Prophet to have said, "Our (the Prophets) property is not inherited. Whatever we leave, is Sadaqa..." Therefore, how true is this? In sha Allah we shall deal with that shortly.

Like we have said, it is inconceivable that Hazrat Fatima and someone she sent to the Khalifah (believed to be her husband Imam Ali) did not respond to the Khalifah's submission as narration in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim wanted us to believe. Readers of these versions of report are hoodwinked that Fatima and that someone gave no response. Rather Fatima turned back angrily and refused to speak with the Khalifah until her death six

---

[471] Shaab al-Din as-Sayiid Mahmud al-Alusi, *Ruhu al-Maani* (Ihyaaha al-Turat al-Arabi), vol. 15, pg. 1
* Al-Hasan was a *Tabi'i,* and freed servant of Zayd ibn Thabit, the Sahabi, and the famous Quran reciter.

months after. In contrast, other version of the report documented her protest thus:

Imam al-Tirmidhi documents:

Narrated Abu Hurairah:

Fatimah came to Abu Bakr and said: Who will inherit from you? He said: My family and my son. She said: So what about me? I do not get inheritance from my father? So Abu Bakr said: I heard the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) say: We are not inherited from but I support those whom the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) used to support, and I spend upon those whom the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) spent upon.[472]

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْمُثَنَّى، حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْوَلِيدِ، حَدَّثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ سَلَمَةَ، عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو، عَنْ أَبِي سَلَمَةَ، عَنْ أَبِي

هُرَيْرَةَ، قَالَ: جَاءَتْ فَاطِمَةُ إِلَى أَبِي بَكْرٍ فَقَالَتْ مَنْ يَرِثُكَ قَالَ أَهْلِي وَوَلَدِي . قَالَتْ فَمَا لِي لاَ أَرِثُ أَبِي

فَقَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَقُولُ لاَ نُورَثُ وَلَكِنِّي أَعُولُ مَنْ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَعُولُهُ وَأُنْفِقُ عَلَى مَنْ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُنْفِقُ عَلَيْهِ .

Sheikh Nasir deen al-Albani comments: Sahih (authentic)

It obviously doesn't make any sense that Hazrat Fatima's first statement to the Khalifah will be in form of a question [Who will inherit from you?]. This question, the Khalifa's reply and Hazrat Fatima's later response suggested that she first demanded her right to inheritance. Then, when the Khalifa responded to her question that "my family and son will inherit me", Hazrat Fatima's response of "What about

---

[472] Muhammad ibn Eesa al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al*-Tirmidhi (Riyadh: Maktab al-Ma'arifah, 1st Edition) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir din al-Albani], pg. 379, Hadith no. 1608

me? I do not get inheritance from my father?" is an argument from the general ruling of the Holy Quran when Allah says:

لِّلرِّجَالِ نَصِيبٌ مِّمَّا تَرَكَ الْوَالِدَانِ وَالْأَقْرَبُونَ وَلِلنِّسَاءِ نَصِيبٌ مِّمَّا تَرَكَ الْوَالِدَانِ وَالْأَقْرَبُونَ مِمَّا قَلَّ مِنْهُ أَوْ كَثُرَ نَصِيبًا مَّفْرُوضًا

Men shall have a portion of what the parents and the near relatives leave, and women shall have a portion of what the parents and the near relatives leave, whether there is little or much of it; a stated portion.[473]

Of course, the Khalifah's final response was the "hadith" that "Prophets are not inherited."

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents Hazrat Fatima's respond to this "hadith:"

Abdullah bin Muhammad ibn abi Shaybah told us, Muhammad ibn Fudayl told us, from al-Waleed bin Jumay`, from abu al-Tufayl that he said:

When the messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) passed away, Fatimah sent to Abu Bakr that: "Did you inherit the messenger or his family?" He replied: "No, his family did." She said: "Then where is the share of the messenger (peace be upon him)?" Abu Bakr said: "I heard the messenger (peace be upon him) say: 'If Allah gives a prophet some means of sustenance then takes his soul, he hands it to the one to take his place (in authority).' So I decided to return it to the Muslims." She said: "You know best what you heard from the messenger of Allah (peace be upon him)."[474]

---

[473] Surah an-Nisa, verse 7

[474] *Musnad* Ahmad ibn Hanbal [Muasassat Risalah] (annotator: Shuaib Arnaut), volume 1, page 191-192, hadith 14. http://library.islamweb.net/hadith/display_hbook.php?bk_no=121&pid=60221&hid=14

حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ ، وَسَمِعْتُهُ مِنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ ، قَالَ : حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ فُضَيْلٍ ، عَنِ الْوَلِيدِ بْنِ جُمَيْعٍ ، عَنْ أَبِي الطُّفَيْلِ ، قَالَ : لَمَّا قُبِضَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَرْسَلَتْ فَاطِمَةُ إِلَى أَبِي بَكْرٍ : أَنْتَ وَرِثْتَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ، أَمْ أَهْلُهُ ؟ قَالَ : فَقَالَ : لَا ، بَلْ أَهْلُهُ ، قَالَتْ : فَأَيْنَ سَهْمُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ؟ قَالَ : فَقَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ : إِنِّي سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ، يَقُولُ : إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ ، إِذَا أَطْعَمَ نَبِيًّا طُعْمَةً ، ثُمَّ قَبَضَهُ جَعَلَهُ لِلَّذِي يَقُومُ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ ، فَرَأَيْتُ أَنْ أَرُدَّهُ عَلَى الْمُسْلِمِينَ ، قَالَتْ : فَأَنْتَ ، وَمَا سَمِعْتَ مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ، أَعْلَمُ

Sheikh Ar'aut comment: Its chain is Hasan [good]. The narrators are trustworthy and are narrators of Sheikhayn [Bukhari and Muslim] except Al-Walid ibn Jumai who is narrator of Muslim. And there are words in it [the hadith] that deprive it the level of sahih [authentic].[475]

The hadith is absolutely Sahih [authentic], but the Sunni hadith expert Sheikh al-Ar'naut seemed to be threatened by "some words" in the hadith; hence, his "hasan [good]" grade of the hadith. Anyway, it is crystal clear from this response that Hadhrat Fatima did not believe in the so-called hadith ascribed to her father otherwise she would have kept silent upon hearing it. And indeed, the Khalifah knew best what he heard from the Prophet.

Imam al-Tirmidhi further gives another piece of information:

Narrated Abu Hurairah:

That Fatimah came to Abu Bakr and Umar may Allah be pleased with them both, to ask them about her inheritance

---

[475] What word or words in the hadith that deprived it the level of sahih when all the narrators are trustworthy? Obviously, the hadith was graded "hasan" polemically.

from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him). They said: "We heard the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) say: I am not inherited from. So, she said: "By Allah! I will never talk to you two again." So she died having not talked to them.[476]

حَدَّثَنَا بِذَلِكَ، عَلِيُّ بْنُ عِيسَى الْبَغْدَادِيُّ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الْوَهَّابِ بْنُ عَطَاءٍ، حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَمْرٍو، عَنْ أَبِي سَلَمَةَ

،عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ، أَنَّ فَاطِمَةَ، جَاءَتْ أَبَا بَكْرٍ وَعُمَرَ رضى الله عنهما تَسْأَلُ مِيرَاثَهَا مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه

وسلم فَقَالاَ سَمِعْنَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَقُول: إِنِّي لاَ أُورَثُ

قَالَتْ وَاللَّهِ لاَ أُكَلِّمُكُمَا أَبَدًا . فَمَاتَتْ وَلاَ تُكَلِّمُهُمَا

Sheikh Nasir deen al-Albani comments: Sahih (authentic)

Interestingly, a 3rd century (A.H) salaf by the name Ali ibn 'Eesa al-Kufi attempted to interpret the response of Hazrat Fatima when he says (as documented below the hadith in Sunan Tirmidhi):

قَالَ عَلِيُّ بْنُ عِيسَى مَعْنَى لاَ أُكَلِّمُكُمَا تَعْنِي فِي هَذَا الْمِيرَاثِ أَبَدًا أَنْتُمَا صَادِقَانِ .

And Ali bin Eisa said: "The meaning of not speaking to you two is: Never again regarding this inheritance, because you two are truthful."452

Obviously, that was a desperate and terrible interpretation from Ali ibn Eesa. The matn (content) in Sahih Bukhari reads:

---

[476] Muhammad ibn Eesa al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al*-Tirmidhi (Riyadh: Maktab al-Ma'arifah, 1st Edition) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir din al-Albani], pg. 379, Hadith no. 1609

"So, she became angry with Abu Bakr and kept away from him, and did not talk to him till she died" (six months according to the same Sahih Bukhari).

If she had adjudged Abubakar and Umar to be truthful in their statement, why would she keep on demanding from them (as Sahih Bukhari documents), and why would she be angry and kept away from them and refused to talk to them till her death (six months after the incident)?

Imam Muhammad ibn Sa'd (d. 230 H) documents:

أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ ، حَدَّثَنِي هِشَامُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ ، عَنْ عَبَّاسِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ مَعْبَدٍ ، عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ ، قَالَ : جَاءَتْ فَاطِمَةُ إِلَى أَبِي بَكْرٍ تَطْلُبُ مِيرَاثَهَا وَجَاءَ الْعَبَّاسُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْمُطَّلِبِ يَطْلُبُ مِيرَاثَهُ وَجَاءَ مَعَهُمَا عَلِيٌّ , فَقَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ : قَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ : لاَ نُورَثُ , مَا تَرَكْنَا صَدَقَةٌ ، وَمَا كَانَ النَّبِيُّ يَعُولُ فَعَلَيَّ ، فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ : وَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوِدَ ، وَقَالَ زَكَرِيَّاءَ : يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوبَ ، قَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ : هُوَ هَكَذَا وَأَنْتَ وَاللَّهِ تَعْلَمُ مِثْلَمَا أَعْلَمُ , فَقَالَ عَلِيٌّ : هَذَا كِتَابُ اللهِ يَنْطِقُ ، فَسَكَتُوا وَانْصَرَفُوا.

Muhammad ibn Umar[477] – Hisham ibn Sa'd – Abbas ibn Abdullah ibn Mabad – Abi Ja'far said:

Fatima came to Abu Bakr asking for her inheritance, and Abbas ibn Abd al-Mutalib also asked for his inheritance and Ali came with them. Abu Bakr said, The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, We do not leave inheritance; whatever we leave is charity, so whoever the Prophet was

[477] ***Muhammad ibn Umar***: Some of the Ahlu Sunnah ahadith scholars graded Muhammad ibn Umar al-Waqidi not reliable in *hadith narration*, others graded him reliable. However, all Ahlu Sunnah scholars adjudged him to be the best and expert in the field of history especially of battles; hence, his book *kitab al-Maghazi* which is heavily relied upon. The fact that the narration above is not a hadith, rather is an athar of incident after the Prophet's demise, then such narration via the route of Muhammad ibn Umar is accepted.

responsible for in their livelihood, I am responsible for. Ali said, "Solomon inherited from David", and Zacharias said, "who may inherit from me and inherit from the house of Jacob." Abu Bakr said, that is right, but by Allah you know the same as what I know. Then Ali said, this is the Book of Allah talking. So they [Ali, Fatima and Abbas] kept quiet and left.[478]

EXAMINING THE HADITH: "OUR (THE PROPHETS) PROPERTY IS NOT INHERITED, WHAT WE LEAVE IS CHARITY"

In previous passages, we submitted in a nutshell Ahlu Sunnah and Shia's opposing views on the issue of Prophets' inheritance. Even if the report of Ibn Sa'd (related in the previous passage) is polemically and adamantly considered weak because of Muhammad ibn Umar, the matn (content of the narration) gives lots of useful information, and there is no running away from the fact that Hazrat Fatima did not accept the Khalifah's excuse of a "hadith" in the name of her beloved father, the illustrious Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny. Therefore, it is expedient to investigate the veracity of the "hadith" related by the Khalifah via the matn of Ibn Sa'd's report. We read in the book of Allah:

HAZRAT YAHYA INHERITED HIS FATHER, HAZRAT ZAKARIYYAH

Prophet Zakariyyah requested from Allah, a son; and was quoted to have said:

وَإِنِّي خِفْتُ الْمَوَالِيَ مِن وَرَائِي وَكَانَتِ امْرَأَتِي عَاقِرًا فَهَبْ لِي مِن لَّدُنكَ وَلِيًّا

And surely, I fear my cousins after me, and my wife is barren, therefore grant me from Thyself an heir

يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوبَ وَاجْعَلْهُ رَبِّ رَضِيًّا

---

[478] Muhammad ibn Sa'd, *kitab Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra* (Cairo: al-Nashr Maktaba al-Khanji, 1st Edition, 1421 H) [annotator: Dr. Ali Muhammad Umar], vol. 2, p. 274

Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub, and make him, my Lord, one in whom Thou art well pleased."[479]

Every healthy mind can easily rationalize these verses that Prophet Zakariyah was asking for a son that will inherit him materially fearing what his relatives could do after him. Some Ahlu Sunnah's scholars however, are of different opinion while others support the view.

FIRST OPINION

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir in his Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem share his own opinion:

(And verily, I fear Mawali after me) Mujahid, Qatadah and As-Suddi, all said, "In saying the word Mawali, he (Zakariyya) meant his succeeding relatives." The reason for his fear was that he was afraid that the generation that would succeed him would be a wicked generation.

Thus, he asked Allah for a son who would be a Prophet after him, who would guide them with his prophethood and that which was revealed to him. In response to this I would like to point out that he was not afraid of them inheriting his wealth. For a Prophet is too great in status, and too lofty in esteem to become remorseful over his wealth in this fashion. A Prophet would not disdain to leave his wealth to his successive relatives, and thus ask to have a son who would receive his inheritance instead of them. This is one angle of argument.

The second argument is that Allah did not mention that he (Zakariyya) was wealthy. On the contrary, he was a carpenter who ate from the earnings of his own hand. This type of person usually does not have a mass of wealth. Amassing wealth is not something normal for Prophets, for verily, they are the most abstentious in matters of this worldly life. The third argument is that it is confirmed in the Two Sahihs, in more than one narration, that the Messenger of Allah said, «لَا نُورَثُ، مَا تَرَكْنَا فَهُوَ صَدَقَة» (We (the

[479] Surah Maryam, verse 5 – 6

Prophets) do not leave behind inheritance. Whatever we leave behind, then it is charity.) In a narration recorded by At-Tirmidhi with an authentic chain of narrations, he said:

«نَحْنُ مَعْشَرَ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ لَا نُورَث» (We, Prophets do not leave behind inheritance (of wealth)

Therefore, the meaning in these Hadiths restricts the meaning of Zakariyya's statement, ﴿فَهَبْ لِي مِن لَّدُنكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِي﴾ (So give me from yourself an heir. Who shall inherit me,) inheritance of prophethood. For this reason, Allah said,

﴿وَيَرِثُ مِنْ ءَالِ يَعْقُوبَ﴾(and inherit (also) the posterity of Ya`qub.) This is similar to Allah's statement, ﴿وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَـٰنُ دَاوُۥدَ﴾(And Sulayman inherited from Dawud [27:16]). This means that he inherited prophethood from him. If this had meant wealth, he would not have been singled with it among his other brothers. There also would have been no important benefit in mentioning it if it was referring to wealth. It is already well-known and established in all of the previous laws and divinely revealed creeds, that the son inherits the wealth of his father. Therefore, if this was not referring to a specific type of inheritance, then Allah would not have mentioned it. All of this is supported and affirmed by what is in the authentic Hadith:

«نَحْنُ مَعَاشِرَ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ لَا نُورَثُ، مَا تَرَكْنَا فَهُوَ صَدَقَة» (We Prophets do not leave behind any inheritance (of wealth). Whatever we leave behind, then it is charity.) Mujahid said concerning his statement, ﴿يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ ءَالِ يَعْقُوبَ﴾(Who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Yaqub.) ﴿19:6﴾"His inheritance was knowledge, and Zakariyya was one of the descendants of Ya`qub." Hushaym said, "Ismail bin Abi Khalid informed us that Abu Salih commented about the Ayah: ﴿يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ ءَالِ يَعْقُوبَ﴾(who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Ya`qub.) "He would be a Prophet like his forefathers were Prophets. Allah's statement, (and make him, my Lord, one with whom You are well-pleased!) means "Make him pleasing to You

(Allah) and your creation. Love him and make him beloved to your creatures, in both his religion and his character."[480]

That was al-Hafiz ibn Kathir's submission. It is crystal clear that his opinion was largely influenced by the "hadith" ["We the Prophets do not leave behind any inheritance..."]. Ibn Kathir states another excuse by saying:

"It is not befitting a Prophet to amass wealth; Zakariyyah was a carpenter and was not known to be wealthy etc"

This excuse is untenable. For a fact, no one argued that Prophets of Allah should hoard up wealth. At the same time, being a carpenter never meant he could not have valuable properties [like land, farm etc] no matter how little it is.

And his other argument that: it is already known in every law that sons inherited their fathers, therefore for Allah to mention Zakariyyah's request of a son to inherit him suggested that he didn't mean material inheritance rather he meant Prophethood. This is another flaw of an argument. First, Allah has long ago ceeded the tree of Prophet-hood in the lineage of Prophet Ibrahim, Zakariyyah's great grandfather. Going by Ibn Kathir's same argument, why would he ask what has been ordained already in his family line? Besides, Prophet-hood is not inherited. Only Allah chooses His Prophets. Second, his fear of his bad relatives was clearly stated amidst the fact that his wife was barren. Bad relatives usually treat barren wife of their deceased brothers wickedly and confiscate his properties. It is in Prophet Zakariyyah's right to request from Allah an heir that will inherit him and take care of his belongings after his demise.

---

[480] Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Azeem*, under sura Matram, verse 5 - 7. http://www.qtafsir.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2693&Itemid=75

SECOND AND CONTRARY OPINION

The Ahlu Sunnah premier Imam, Muhammad ibn Jarir at-Tabari (d. 310 H) did justice to the above verses by relying largely on the opinions of Salaf. He writes:

وقوله : (يرثني ويرث من آل يعقوب) يقول : يرثني من بعد وفاتي مالي ، ويرث من آل يعقوب النبوة ، وذلك

. أن زكريا كان من ولد يعقوب

حدثنا أبو كريب ، قال : ثنا جابر بن نوح ، عن إسماعيل ، عن أبي صالح ، قوله (يرثني ويرث من آل يعقوب)

. يقول : يرث مالي ، ويرث من آل يعقوب النبوة

حدثنا مجاهد ، قال : ثنا يزيد ، قال : أخبرنا إسماعيل ، عن أبي صالح في قوله (يرثني ويرث من آل يعقوب)

. قال: يرث مالي ، ويرث من آل يعقوب النبوة

حدثني يعقوب ، قال : ثنا هشيم ، قال : أخبرنا إسماعيل بن أبي خالد ، عن أبي صالح ، في قوله (يرثني ويرث

من آل يعقوب) قال : يرثني مالي ، ويرث من آل يعقوب النبوة . [ص: 146]

حدثنا أبو كريب ، قال : ثنا جابر بن نوح ، عن مبارك ، عن الحسن ، قال : قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم : رحم الله أخي زكريا ، ما كان عليه من ورثة ماله حين يقول فهب لي من لدنك وليا ، يرثني ويرث من .آل يعقوب

His saying: (Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub {19:6}), it said that it means: "Who should inherit from me my property after my death and inherit from the children of Yaqoub (a.s), the Prophethood, because Zakariya (peace be upon him) was of the children of Yaqoub (peace be upon him).

Narrated Abu Kurayb from Jabir ibn Nuh from Ismaeel from Abi Saleh about the verse: "Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub" {19:6], he says, it means: "Who should inherit my property, and inherit the Prophethood from the children of Yaqoub"

Narrated Mujahid from Yazeed from Ismaeel from Abi Saleh about this verse: "Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub" {19:6}, he said: "Who should inherit my property, and inherit the Prophethood from the children of Yaqoub (a.s)."

Narrated Yaqoub from Hushaym from Ismaeel ibn Khalid from Abi Saleh about this verse: "Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub" {19:6}, he said: "Who should inherit my property, and inherit the Prophethood from the children of Yaqoub (a.s)."

Narrated Aboo Kurayb from Jabir ibn Nooh from Mubarak from Al-Hassan who said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: "May Allah (swt) bless my brother Zakariyya (a.s), he did not have heirs for his property when he said: "Therefore grant me from Thyself an heir, Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub" {19:5-6}.[481]

On the other side of the aisle, Shia scholars also agreed with what Ibn Jarir Al-Tabari have said. For example, Ayatullah Agha Mahdi Puya (d. 1317 H) writes in the Tafsir under the same verse:

'These verses prove that the Prophets of Allah inherit and leave inheritance. To interpret "warith" as reference to

---

[481] Muhammad ibn Jarir Tabari, *Tafsir Al-Tabari* (Dar al-Marifa), Vol. 15, Pg. # 457 - 459. under sura Matram, verse 5 – 7

knowledge and wisdom only is a deviation from the real, direct and plain meaning of this word, without any external or internal evidence. If inheritance of personal belongings is excluded, the repetition of the verb becomes meaningless because Zakariyyah himself was a descendant of Ahli Yaqub, who inherited the Prophet-hood and wisdom of his ancestors, and his son would do the same if Allah so willed as He chooses whomsoever He will as His messenger (An'am: 124), therefore, Zakariyyah said, "inherit me and inherit ahli Yaqub". Zakariyyah is referring to his belongings and the belongings of the posterity of Yaqub separately.

The first verb refers to the inheritance of his property which Zakariyyah thought would be appropriated by his relatives if he remained childless; and the second verb refers to the Prophet-hood, he wanted for Yahya, for which there was no need to fear that it would be taken by anyone ....

No doubt the Prophets of Allah did not give any importance to the material possessions and laid emphasis on the knowledge and wisdom, but it does not mean that they did not possess property or did not leave what they had as inheritance to their next of kin.

The tradition quoted to deprive Bibi Fatima of her lawful inheritance was tampered with by the narrator for political reasons. He omitted a clause indicating that they leave knowledge as inheritance, and added clause, which is not correct from the grammatical point of view, unless it is an objective clause subordinate to the principal clause "We the group of Prophets," and the word be read as "sadaqtan," the second object to the verb "taraknahu," but he read the clause as co-ordinative and conjuctive, and read "sadaqtan" as the predicate to the word "ma" means "that which."[482]

---

[482] Mira Mahdi Puya Yazdi, *The Holy Quran* [Tahrike Tarsile Quran, New York; 5th Edition; 2005], sura Maryam verse 2 – 6. http://quran.al-islam.org/

HADHRAT SULAYMAN INHERITED THE KINGDOM OF HIS FATHER, HADHRAT DAWOOD

Apart from the case of Prophet Zakariyyah and his son, our Lord also relates the case of Prophet Dawood thus:

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُودَ

And Sulaiman was Dawud's heir.[483]

Again, Ibn Kathir as expected, choose to argue that the inheritance here was not material; however, he left a piece of information that threatens if not destroys all his submission altogether. He writes:

وقوله : (وورث سليمان داود) أي : في الملك والنبوة ، وليس المراد وراثة المال ; إذ لو كان كذلك لم يخص سليمان وحده من بين سائر أولاد داود ، فإنه قد كان لداود مائة امرأة . ولكن المراد بذلك وراثة الملك والنبوة ; فإن الأنبياء لا تورث أموالهم ، كما أخبر بذلك رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - [في قوله] : نحن معشر الأنبياء لا نورث ، ما تركناه صدقة .{ وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَـنُ دَاوُودَ﴾

(And Sulayman inherited from Dawud) means, in kingship and prophethood. What is meant here is not wealth, because if that were the case, Sulayman would not have been singled out from among the sons of Dawud, as Dawud had one hundred wives. Rather what is meant is the inheritance of kingship and prophethood, for the wealth of the Prophets cannot be inherited, as the Messenger of Allah said:

«نَحْنُ مَعَاشِرَ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ لَا نُورَثُ، مَا تَرَكْنَاهُ فَهُوَ صَدَقَة»

---

[483] Surah An-Naml, Verse 16

(We Prophets cannot be inherited from; whatever we leave behind is charity.)[484]

Imam Ibn Jarir Tabari also bring his input:

يقول تعالى ذكره : (وورث سليمان) أباه (داود) العلم الذي كان آتاه الله في حياته ، والملك الذي كان خصه به على سائر قومه ، فجعله له بعد أبيه داود دون سائر ولد أبيه (وقال يا أيها الناس علمنا منطق الطير) يقول : وقال سليمان لقومه : يا أيها الناس علمنا منطق الطير ، يعني فهمنا كلامها ; وجعل ذلك من الطير كمنطق الرجل من بني آدم إذ فهمه عنها .

Most High says: (Sulayman was heir) of his father (Dawud)'s knowledge that Allah gave him in his life, and kingdom to whom he was singled out over the rest of his people, and was made (king) after his father Dawud with the exception of his father's (other) son (and he said: O men! we have been taught the language of birds). He says: And Sulayman said to his people: and he said: O men! we have been taught the language of birds, that is we understood their language; ...[485]

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir suggested "kingship and Prophethood" to mean what Sulayman inherited. On the other hand, Imam Ibn Jarir Tabari suggested "Knowledge and Kingdom". Prophet-hood is not an inherited position. Only Allah chooses and makes whoever He wishes to become Prophet. For example, Prophet Isa is quoted by Allah to have said:

قَالَ إِنِّي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ آتَانِيَ الْكِتَابَ وَجَعَلَنِي نَبِيًّا

---

[484] Ismail ibn Umar Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem,* Sura an-Nahml verse 16

[485] Muhammad ibn Jarir Tabari, *Tafsir Al-Tabari* (Dar al-Marifa) Sura an-Nahml verse 16

He said: Surely, I am a servant of Allah; He has given me the Book and made me a prophet[486]

By Allah's divine inspiration, an incumbent Prophet will know his successor. And some Prophets even had the opportunity to "monitor, train, and guide" their successor in their spiritual development. To say "Prophethood" is inherited will only be meaningful if "succession and ordainment of B after the death of A" is meant otherwise the literal meaning of "warith (inherited)" as used in the ayah will be defeated. In the same vein, conceptual "knowledge" just like "Prophethood" is granted and bestowed by Allah. Allah says in His glorious book:

وَلَقَدْ آتَيْنَا دَاوُودَ وَسُلَيْمَانَ عِلْمًا وَقَالَا الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الَّذِي فَضَّلَنَا عَلَىٰ كَثِيرٍ مِّنْ عِبَادِهِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

And certainly, We gave knowledge to Dawood and Sulaiman, and they both said: Praise be to Allah, Who has made us to excel many of His believing servants.[487]

Also, if "knowledge" is learnt, then it is no inheritance in the literal sense of "warith." However, if it is inherited, a physical concept of that (knowledge) is meant. For example, Allah says: ثُمَّ أَوْرَثْنَا الْكِتَابَ الَّذِينَ اصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا Then, We gave the Book for an inheritance to those whom We chose from among Our servants.."[488]

Besides, Prophet Dawud was a skilled craftsman who worked with irons from the beginning (extraction of iron ores, smelting and molding) to excellent craftworks. Sulayman can only learn this kind of knowledge and then inherited tools and workshop of his father. This is only what will be consistent with the literal meaning of "warith" otherwise it is Allah who gave Sulayman knowledge. Interestingly, both Ibn Kathir and Ibn Jarir Al-Tabari made mention of "kingship or kingdom (mulk)" as part of

---

[486] Surah Maryam, Verse 30
[487] Surah An-Naml, Verse 15
[488] Surah Fatir: 32

their second suggestions of what Prophet Sulayman inherited from his father. "Mulk" could be "kingship" (a state of being, or the official position of a King) or "the Kingdom" (state or territory ruled by a king). The fact however is that there is no king without kingdom. Every king has kingdom he rules over.

In the case of Prophet Dawud (peace be upon him), after the death of a non-Israelite, God-ordained King Talut (Saul), Allah made him (Dawud) king and he inherited the Kingdom of Talut. Quran says:

وَقَتَلَ دَاوُودُ جَالُوتَ وَآتَاهُ اللَّهُ الْمُلْكَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَعَلَّمَهُ مِمَّا يَشَاء

And Dawood slew Jalut (Goliath), and Allah gave him kingdom and wisdom, and taught him of what He pleased...[489]

Here, al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir writes:

Talut promised that whoever killed Jalut, would marry his daughter and would share his kingship and authority. He kept his promise. Later, the kingship was transferred to Prophet Dawud in addition to being granted Prophethood by Allah. So, Allah said:

﴿وَآتَـهُ اللَّهُ الْمُلْكَ﴾(...and Allah gave him (Dawud) the kingdom that Talut had and...[490]

It is this very KINGDOM of Prophet Dawud that his son Prophet Sulayman INHERITED when he became king after the death of his father. Then, he requested from Allah to make his kingdom grand:

---

[489] Sura al-baqara: 251

[490] Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem* (Dar tayba; 1422 A.H); sura al-baqara, ayah 251; http://www.qtafsir.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=143#4

قَالَ رَبِّ اغْفِرْ لِي وَهَبْ لِي مُلْكًا لَّا يَنبَغِي لِأَحَدٍ مِّن بَعْدِي إِنَّكَ أَنتَ الْوَهَّابُ

He said: My Lord! do Thou forgive me and grant me a kingdom which is not fit for (being inherited by) anyone after me.[491]

CHILDREN OF MUSA AND CHILDREN OF HARUN INHERITED "PROPERTIES" OF THEIR FATHERS

In the story of King Talut (Saul) whom Allah appointed, it is gathered that he was belittled and rejected because of his non-Israelite status. Therefore, Allah had him show the sign of his kingdom/kingship to the Bani Israil. Quran says:

وَقَالَ لَهُمْ نَبِيُّهُمْ إِنَّ آيَةَ مُلْكِهِ أَن يَأْتِيَكُمُ التَّابُوتُ فِيهِ سَكِينَةٌ مِّن رَّبِّكُمْ وَبَقِيَّةٌ مِّمَّا تَرَكَ آلُ مُوسَىٰ وَآلُ هَارُونَ تَحْمِلُهُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ إِنَّ فِي ذَٰلِكَ لَآيَةً لَّكُمْ إِن كُنتُم مُّؤْمِنِينَ

And the prophet said to them: Surely the sign of His kingdom is, that there shall come to you the chest in which there is tranquillity from your Lord and residue of the relics of what the children of Musa and the children of Haroun have left, the angels bearing it; most surely there is a sign in this for those who believe.[492]

What were the relics that the children of Musa and children of Harun left that were in the protection of the angels until it reached Talut?

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir writes:

---

[491] Surah Saad, verse 35

[492] Surah al-Baqarah, verse 248

قول نبيهم لهم : إن علامة بركة ملك طالوت عليكم أن يرد الله عليكم التابوت الذي كان أخذ منكم .

فيه سكينة من ربكم قيل : معناه فيه وقار ، وجلالة .

قال عبد الرزاق عن معمر عن قتادة (فيه سكينة أي : وقار . وقال الربيع : رحمة . وكذا روي عن العوفي عن ابن عباس وقال ابن جريج : سألت عطاء عن قوله : (فيه سكينة [من ربكم]) قال : ما يعرفون من آيات الله فيسكنون إليه .

وقيل : السكينة طست من ذهب كانت تغسل فيه قلوب الأنبياء ، أعطاها الله موسى عليه السلام فوضع فيها الألواح . ورواه السدي عن أبي مالك عن ابن عباس .

وقال سفيان الثوري : عن سلمة بن كهيل عن أبي الأحوص عن علي قال : السكينة لها وجه كوجه الإنسان ثم هي روح هفافة .

وقال ابن جرير : حدثني [ابن] المثنى حدثنا أبو داود حدثنا شعبة وحماد بن سلمة ، وأبو الأحوص كلهم عن سماك عن خالد بن عرعرة عن علي قال : السكينة ريح خجوج ولها [ص: 667] رأسان .

وقال مجاهد : لها جناحان وذنب . وقال محمد بن إسحاق عن وهب بن منبه : السكينة رأس هرة ميتة إذا صرخت في التابوت بصراخ هر ، أيقنوا بالنصر وجاءهم الفتح .

وقال عبد الرزاق : أخبرنا بكار بن عبد الله أنه سمع وهب بن منبه يقول : السكينة روح من الله تتكلم إذا اختلفوا في شيء تكلم فأخبرهم ببيان ما يريدون .

وقوله : (وبقية مما ترك آل موسى وآل هارون) قال ابن جرير : أخبرنا ابن المثنى حدثنا أبو الوليد حدثنا حماد عن داود بن أبي هند عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس في هذه الآية : (وبقية مما ترك آل موسى وآل هارون) قال : عصاه ورضاض الألواح . وكذا قال قتادة والسدي والربيع بن أنس وعكرمة وزاد : والتوراة .

وقال أبو صالح (وبقية) يعني : عصا موسى وعصا هارون ولوحين من التوراة والمن .

وقال عطية بن سعد : عصا موسى وعصا هارون وثياب موسى وثياب هارون ورضاض الألواح .

وقال عبد الرزاق : سألت الثوري عن قوله : (وبقية مما ترك آل موسى وآل هارون) فقال : منهم من يقول قفيز من من ، ورضاض الألواح . ومنهم من يقول : العصا والنعلان .

وقوله : (تحمله الملائكة) قال ابن جريج : قال ابن عباس : جاءت الملائكة تحمل التابوت بين السماء والأرض حتى وضعته بين يدي طالوت ، والناس ينظرون .

وقال السدي : أصبح التابوت في دار طالوت فآمنوا بنبوة شمعون وأطاعوا طالوت .

Their Prophet then proclaimed, "The sign of the blessings of Talut's kingship over you is that Allah will give you back the Tabut (wooden box) that has been taken from you. Allah said: ﴿فِيهِ سَكِينَةٌ مِّن رَّبِّكُمْ﴾(wherein is Sakinah from your Lord) meaning, peace (or grace) and reassurance. `Abdur-Razzaq stated that Qatadah said:

﴿فِيهِ سَكِينَةٌ﴾(wherein is Sakinah) means grace. In addition, Ar-Rabi` said that Sakinah means mercy. This is also the meaning given by Ibn `Abbas, as Al-`Awfi narrated.

Allah then said: ﴿وَبَقِيَّةٌ مِّمَّا تَرَكَ ءَالُ مُوسَى وَءَالُ هَـرُونَ﴾(...and a remnant of that which the children of Musa (Moses) and children of Harun (Aaron) left behind)

Ibn Jarir related that Ibn `Abbas said about this Ayah:

﴿وَبَقِيَّةٌ مِّمَّا تَرَكَ ءَالُ مُوسَى وَءَالُ هَـرُونَ﴾(...and a remnant of that which children of Musa (Moses) and children of Harun (Aaron) left behind) Meaning, Moses staff and the remnants of the Tablets. This is the same Tafsir of Qatadah, As-Suddi, Ar-Rabi` bin Anas and `Ikrimah, who added, "And also the Torah. `Abdur-Razzaq said that he asked Ath-Thawri about the meaning of ﴿وَبَقِيَّةٌ مِّمَّا تَرَكَ ءَالُ مُوسَى وَءَالُ هَـرُونَ﴾(...and a remnant of that which Musa (Moses) and Harun (Aaron) left behind,)

Ath-Thawri said, "some said that it contained a pot of manna and the remnants of the Tablets, while some others said that it contained (Moses) staff and two shoes (and refer to 20:12). Allah then said: ﴿تَحْمِلُهُ الْمَلَـئِكَةُ﴾(...carried by the angels).

Ibn Jurayj stated that Ibn `Abbas said, "The angels came down while carrying the Tabut between the sky and the earth, until they placed it before Talut while the people were watching. As-Suddi said, "The Tabut was brought to Talut's house, so the people believed in the prophethood of Sham`un (Simeon) and obeyed Talut."'[493]

---

[493] Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem* (Dar tayba; 1422 A.H); sura al-baqara, ayah 248

http://library.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?idfrom=210&idto=210&bk_no=49&ID=214

What we have learnt from this report of Ibn Kathir is that children of Musa and children of Harun were in the possession of their father's properties – staff, shoes, pot of manna, and remnant of tablet. Only our Lord knows what the children of Prophet Harun possessed of their father's properties. They inherited these properties, guard them until they left them (after their death). These valuable properties were so important and precious that in order not to fall in wrong hands, angels took responsibility of guarding them.

From Prophet Yahya, Prophet Sulayman to the children of Musa and children of Harun who inherited or had possession or were in charge of their father's properties, where does the hadith ["We (the Prophets) do not leave behind inheritance. Whatever we leave behind, then it is charity"] alleged to be from the holy Prophet stands? Why did the properties of Prophet Zakariyyah, kingdom of Prophet Dawud and properties of Prophet Musa and Prophet Haroun not go into charity as the alleged hadith claims?

We have established previously that Hadhrat Fatima did not believe in the authenticity of the report ascribed to her father otherwise she would not have persisted in demanding the inheritance left by her father. This was a lady described as flesh of the Prophet. She was trained and taught by her father, the holy Prophet. Her husband, Hazrat Ali ibn Abi Talib who was the most knowledgeable and the best judge of the Ummah – was also trained and taught by the Prophet.

Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir documents Hadhrat Ali to have said:

قال شعبة بن الحجاج ، عن سماك ، عن خالد بن عرعرة أنه سمع عليا وشعبة أيضا ، عن القاسم بن أبي بزة ، عن أبي الطفيل ، سمععليا .
وثبت أيضا من غير وجه ، عن أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب : أنه صعد منبر الكوفة فقال : لا تسألوني عن آية في كتاب الله ، ولا عن سنة عن رسول الله ، إلا أنبأتكم بذلك

Shubah b. al-Hajjaj, from Simak, from Khalid b. Ararah that he heard Ali, and Shubah again narrated from al-Qasim b. Abi Barrah from Abu al-Tufayl that he heard Ali, and it also authentically transmitted through many chains that Amir al-Muminin Ali b. Abi Talib climbed the pulpit of Kufah and said, "You will not ask me about ANY verse in the Book of Allah, or about ANY sunah from the Messenger of Allah, except that I will inform you of that.[494]

Therefore, how is it possible that none of Imam Ali and Hadhrat Fatima will be unaware of the alleged hadith quoted by the Khalifah Abubakar? Apart from being the closest to the Prophet, none of them [Ali and Fatima] was ever separated from him. And what audacity would they have not to accept the hadith had it been they believe in its authenticity? Rather both of them continued to demand the inheritance, distanced themselves from the Khalifah, and Hadhrat Fatima never talked to the Khalifah till she died. Perhaps this was what pestered Allamah Shah Abdul Haq Muhadith Dehalwi (d. 1052) in his book when he wrote:

The case of Fatima al Zahra is difficult among all the cases. If I say that Fatima was ignorant with regards to the Hadeeth cited by Abu Bakr then it is impossible and if I say that she was not provided the opportunity to hear this Hadeeth then it is also difficult, because after hearing this Hadeeth from Abu Bakr and the testimonies of the Sahaba, she did not accept the Hadeeth which is why she became angry. If she had become angry before hearing the Hadeeth then why didn't desist from her anger, anger that was so lengthy that she did not talk to Abu Bakr as long as she remained alive"[495]

Contrary to the claim of Allamah Shah Abdul Haq that "sahabah testified" to the hadith, it is expedient to point out that no sahabah was asked to or ever testified to the alleged hadith when Khalifah Abubakar mentioned it. It

---

[494] Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem* (Dar Taybat; 1422 A. H), sura ad-Dhariyyat; vol. 7, p. 413.

[495] *Ash'at al-Lam'aat Sharh Mishkat* (Farid Book Stall, Urdu Bazar, Lahore; Urdu translation by Allamah Muhammad Abdul Hakeem Sharaf Qadri), Volume 5 pages 353-354

was only after the death of the Khalifah Abubakar that several other sahabah (starting from the second Khalifah, Umar ibn al Khattab) started repeating it. Khalifah Abubakar was the first to ever mention the alleged hadith, and after his demise, others followed suit. And no doubt, many of the sahabah were mudaliseen (quoting the Prophet directly while in truth they heard the quoted saying from another sahabah, and not directly from the Prophet).[496]

CONCLUSION

Indeed, it is inconceivable that the noble Prophet will reveal to her daughter the secret of her death after him but not about disposition of his will which is the most important issue a dying man must addressed. Fatima, alayha salam, is the chief of all the believing women [Sahih al-Bukhari 6285, 6286]; a part of Rasulullah and whoever makes her angry, makes Rasulullah angry [Sahih al-Bukhari 3767]. 'Aishah said, "I have never seen anyone who spoke more truthfully than her (Fatima), except he that gave birth to her."[497]

Being a part of the purified Ahl al-Bayt, a part of Rasulullah, the truthful one and chief of all the believing women simply indicates her impeccable knowledge and adherence to the book of Allah and the Sunnah of the Prophet. And having Ali ibn Abi Talib as a husband, the self of the Prophet, a person who knew and adhered to the entirety of the noble Qu'ran and Sunnah of the Prophet; then, how is it possible that both will be "ignorant" of the "hadith" of the Prophet regarding inheritance of Prophets? And how is it possible for both of them to reject the "hadith" when being told had there been truthfulness in the hadith? And how is it possible that someone whose angry is exactly Rasulullah's will get angry on ignorance, trivial and subjective matter?

---

[496] In Ahlu Sunnah's ilm hadith, *Tadlis* is not a crime or criteria to reject hadith if done by a sahabi.

[497] Al-Hakim, *al-Mustadrak 'ala as-Sahihayn, hadith 4756(354).*

By Allah! It is very obvious that the hadith "We Prophets do not leave behind any inheritance (of wealth). Whatever we leave behind is charity" is a fabrication and a lie upon the noble Prophet. And confiscating the vast fertile land of Fadak and other personal properties of the Prophet was a great oppression, injustice and tyranny upon the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt.

CHAPTER FOURTY-ONE

FEW QUR'ANIC VERSES

Question 64:

Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala, says in the Noble Qur'an:

"Indeed, Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave the pledge to you [O Muhammad, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam] under the tree. He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down As-Sakina (calmness and tranquility) upon them, and He rewarded them with a near victory" (Q48:18).

By the above pronouncement of Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala, to whom is He referring? Are they dwellers of hellfire or paradise? The whole world concurs that the three leaders (Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman) are included in the above statement. Is it right to castigate those who helped in the upliftment of Islam as a religion—those whom Allah is pleased with and to whom all the good tidings one can think of were directed? By Allah's confirmation of what is in their hearts, is it faith or hypocrisy? Are calmness and tranquility coupled with victory for or against the religion?

Question 65:

Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala, says:

"And know that among you there is a Messenger of Allah. If he were to obey you (i.e., follow your opinions and desires) in much of the matter, you would surely be in trouble. But Allah has endeared faith to you and has beautified it in your hearts, and has made disbelief, wickedness, and disobedience (to Allah and His Messenger, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam) hateful to you. Such are they who are rightly guided" (Q49:7).

We have only one question regarding the above verse: Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala, is informing us of their inner belief and faith in their hearts, while conversely you are saying it is hypocrisy. Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala, confirmed how He instilled in them love for truth and hatred for falsehood, yet you totally disagree. Are you more knowledgeable than Allah?

THE REPLY

Kindly read "Chapter thirty-nine: Did the Sahabah Apostatized?" for detailed expositions on Sahabah.

MOURNING THE MASTER OF THE MARTYRS

CHAPTER FOURTY-TWO

WHO KILLED IMAM AL-HUSEIN?

Question 66:

Who assassinated Hussain, Radiyallahu Anhu? I know your response will be "Yazid"! I will ask: what is your proof?

Let us refer to your books as our arbiter on this issue, because your books have shown Yazid's innocence regarding this evil deed! In the book "A'aynu-sh-Shi'ah," part 1, pp. 34, Sayyid Muhsin Al-Amin said: "20,000 people pledged to Hussain, and they are all Iraqi indigenes." Who are they? "They are the Shi'ites... They were deceitful and deceived him. They fought against him while they offered him their pledge and later assassinated him."

It is now clear that the Shi'ites assassinated him; then why all the accusations? Imam Zainul Abidin remarked as follows to the Shi'ites of Kufah in "Al-Ihtijaj" (2/32): "Have you forgotten the letter you wrote to my father? You were deceitful; you gave him your full and complete pledge, and later on fought him and disgraced him with all his honor." With what will you face the Noble Prophet when he says: "You waged war against my family, you dishonored my household, and you are not part of my people (Ummah)"?

In another narration in the same book (2/29), he says: "The Shi'ites wail because of the assassination of my parents. Who massacred them if not the Shi'ites?" One surprising thing is that if you go through the names of the people who participated in this massacre and those 20,000 who wrote letters of pledge to him, even the governor who gave the command was under Ali's, Radiyallahu Anhu, army during "the Battle of Siffin." The Shi'ites indeed!

One of the Shi'ite scholars who confirmed the story of how the Shi'ites assassinated Hussain was Kazim Al-Ahsa'i in the book "Ashura," pp. 89; Abbas Al-Qummi in "Nafathul Mamuni," pp. 365; Al-Tusi in "Muntahal A'amal" (1/485); and Murtadha Mutahhari in "Malhamatul Hussainiyyah" (4/94).

Now that we have proven that the sycophants and hypocrites among the Shi'ites are those who assassinated Hussain, they are now pretending to wail for this action. We will proceed to give the full details of how it occurred.

The people of Kufah, after realizing their actions, formed a host of multiple "Repentants" called "the Battalion of Repentants." They now repent and realize what they did against Allah. Hussain was peacefully living in the sacred town of Makkah when they sent him a letter signed by 15,000 to 20,000 citizens. Realizing how committed they were waiting for his arrival to actualize their coup d'état, he automatically arranged to follow them; he never listened to the advice he was given against their deceitful attitude. He only sent his paternal uncle's son, Muslim bin Aqil; he was warmly welcomed and signaled Hussain to continue with his attempt. When the messenger left, they immediately changed and betrayed him by murdering him. Hussain was unaware; he reached a place close to Kufah called Karbala. He thought thousands of people would come to welcome him, but he saw faces from his father's army whom he recognized claiming to be those welcoming him! They really came to assassinate him after all the peaceful alternatives he had offered them.

THE REPLY

There are two misconceptions that need to be clarified before the main question is answered.

First, if the word "Shi'a" is used, it is not necessarily means "those who believe in the wilayah [leadership] of the Ahl al-Bayt." During the battle of Siffin, for example, the two waring factions were called "Shi'ah of Ali" and "Shi'ah of

Uthman." In this political context, it simply signifies "supporters" and did not connote the ideological beliefs known with Shi'ism. This is the case in Iraq. There is no doubt of the fact that Iraq was the hub of the Shi'ah; however, there were political Shi'ah as well as ideological Shi'ah in Iraq. Those who fought with Imam Ali and Imam al-Hasan constitute these two groups of Shi'ah. The same way some Muslims (sahabah) deserted the noble Prophet and fled repeatedly in many battlefields, some Shi'ah opportunists deserted Imam Ali and Imam al-Hasan, and later Imam al-Husein. Only the real ideological Shi'ah used to remain with their Imams. It is ignorance and insincerity to put these two groups in the same basket because of the fact that they shared common name – Shi'ah.

Second, the word "people of Iraq" does not necessarily mean "the Shi'ah" as the professor tried to hoodwink his followers when he writes:

Sayyid Muhsinu Al-Amin said; "20,000 people pledged to Hussain and they are all Iraqi indigenes"

Unfortunately, our professor adds his own spice saying "who are they? 'They are the Shi'ites." Interestingly, one of the leaders of these "people of Iraq" who pledged allegiance to al-Husein via his representative (Muslim ibn Aqil) was a notable Sahabi (companion) of the Prophet by the name of Sulayman ibn Surad al-Khuza'i. Imam Dhahabi writes about him:

سليمان بن صرد

الأمير أبو مطرف الخزاعي الكوفي الصحابي

له رواية يسيرة وعن أبي وجبير بن مطعم

وعنه يحي بن يعمر وعدي بن ثابت وأبو إسحاق واخرونقال ابن عبد البر كان ممن كاتب الحسين ليبايعه فلما عجز عن نصره ندم وحارب

قلت كان دينا عابدا خرج في جيش تابوا إلى الله من خذلانهم الحسين الشهيد وساروا للطلب بدمه وسموا جيش التوابين وكان هو الذي بارز يوم صفين حوشبا ذا ظليم فقتله

حض سليمان على الجهاد وسار في ألوف لحرب عبيد الله بن زياد وقال إن قتلت فأميركم المسيب بن نجبة والتقى الجمعان وكان عبيد الله في جيش عظيم فالتحم القتال ثلاثة أيام وقتل خلق من الفريقين واستحر القتل بالتوابين شيعة الحسين وقتل أمراؤهم الأربعة سليمان والمسيب وعبد الله بن سعد وعبد الله بن والي وذلك بعين الوردة التي تدعى رأس العين سنة خمس وستين وتحيز بمن بقي منهم رفاعة بن شداد إلى الكوفة

Sulayman bin Surad, the Leader of the al Khuza'i in Kufa, the Sahabi,

He has a few narrations from Ubay and Jubayr bin Mut'im from Yahya bin Ya'mar and Uday bin Thabit and Abu Ishaq and others. Ibn Barr states 'He (Sulayman) was amongst those that wrote to al-Hussain and gave him bayya. They were unable to support him and greatly regretted this, and subsequently waged war. I am of the opinion that he was a pious religious individual, he joined the army on account of his sin of failing to support Hussain [r], he made tawba (asked for forgiveness) and left to avenge the shedding of his (Hussain's) blood, this army was known as the army of the Tawabun. ...[498]

This leads us to the main question as stated by the Professor. Again, he writes:

---

[498] Shamsudeen Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Uthman Dhahabi, *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah, 1st Edition, 1401 H)[annotator: Shuaib al-Ar'naut], vol. 3, pg. 394 – 395.

Who assassinated Hussain Radiyallahu Anhu? I know your response will be "Yazid"!! I will say; what is your proof?

It has been proven[499] beyond doubt that Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah ordered the killing of al-Husein if he refused to pay him the oath of allegiance. What actually happened to the "people of Iraq" and why did they desert al-Husein after paying him their allegiance? Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir gives the change writes:

Upon returning to Makka he [Hussain] received letters from the people of Kufa, He sent Muslim bin Aqeel to go and assess the situation. Outwardly the people portrayed their support for Muslim bin Aqeel and in turn for Hussain – a thousand people gave bayya. Spies notified Nauman bin Basheer, he did not openly adopt tough measures, but in this regard gave a sermon warning people against sedition and urged the people to remain loyal in the bayya that been given to Yazid. One man stood up and said to Nauman 'This matter cannot be curtailed without adopting force, the approach that you have adopted is like that of weak people".

...Yazid said to Ibn Ziyad 'When in Kufa find Muslim bin Aqeel and then kill him. Ibn Ziyad arrived in Kufa with seventeen men, having assessed the situation he spoke to the nobles in his palace and queried the whereabouts of Muslim bin Aqeel. There was some opposition but Ubaydullah abducted these nobles and deterred people from supporting Muslim.

It got to a point that by Maghrib prayers only thirty people remained with him, by night fall they also deserted him. That night Muslim stayed in the home of an elderly lady; her son notified Abdul Rahman bin Asheesh. Abdul Rahman told his father at that same time who was in Ubaydullah's house, Ibn Ziyad asked why the secrecy, they told him and Ibn Ziyad immediately sent seventy to eighty

---

[499] See: *Chapter Twenty: Infallibility of the Imams: Al-Hasan and al-Husein, who was right in their decisions.*

men headed by Ibn Hareeth Makhzomi who was the head of police. Muhammad bin Ashath and Abdul Rahman were with them.

They collectively captured [Muslim] and sent him to Ibn Ziyad's residence. Upon reaching the doors of the residence (he was met by) some of the sons of the Sahaba standing there. Muslim did not recognise them although they recognized him. They were waiting to meet Ibn Ziyad, Muslim's face and clothes were covered in blood, whilst in that state he made a request for water, one of the groups said, 'You will not be able to drink this until you taste the hot water of Hell'. Muslim replied 'Son of Hell you are more entitled to drink the fire of Hell; than me'.[500]

The "people of Iraq" were terrified and terrorised, some of them were killed while others were imprisoned to serve as deterrent for others. And after the killing of Muslim Ibn Aqil, al-Husein representative, the situation was fuzzy. Interestingly, Ubayd Allah Ibn Ziyad tightened the security of Kufa to make sure no one comes in and out; and he masterminded the attack and eventual killing of Imam al-Husein before he even gets to Kufa. When Imam al-Husein and his followers and families were finally murdered cold-blooded, Yazid celebrated.

Imam al-Tabarani (d. 360 H) documents:

حدثنا أبو الزنباع روح بن الفرج المصري ثنا يحي بن بكير حدثني الليث قال أبى الحسين بن علي رضي الله عنهما أن يستأسر فقاتلوه فقتلوه وقتلوا ابنيه وأصحابه الذين قاتلوا منه بمكان يقال له الطف وانطلق بعلي بن حسين وفاطمة بنت حسين وسكينة بنت حسين إلى عبيد الله بن زياد وعلي يومئذ غلام قد بلغ عروبة بهم إلى يزيد بن معاوية فأمر بسكينة فجعلها خلف سريره لئلا ترى رأس أبيها وذو

---

[500] Abu'l Fida al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir al-Damishq, *al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya* (Beirut: Maktabah al-Ma'arifah, 1413 H), vol. 8, pg. 151 – 154

قرابتها وعلي بن الحسين رضي الله عنهما في غل فوضع رأسه فضرب على ثنيتي الحسين رضي الله عنه فقال نفلق هاما من رجال أحبة إلينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلما؟ فقال علي بن الحسين رضي الله عنه ما أصاب من مصيبة في الأرض ولا في أنفسكم إلا في كتاب من قبل أن نبرأها إن ذلك على الله يسير فثقل على يزيد أن يتمثل ببيت شعر وتلا علي آية من كتاب الله عز وجل فقال يزيد بل بما كسبت أيديكم ويعفوا عن كثير فقال علي رضي الله عنه أما والله لو رآنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم مغلولين لأحب أن يخلينا من الغل قال صدقت فخلوهم من الغل قال ولو وقفنا بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على بعد لأحب أن يقربنا قال صدقت فقربوهم فجعلت فاطمة وسكينة يتطاولان لتريان رأس أبيهما وجعل يزيد يتطاول في مجلسه ليستر عنهما رأس أبيهما ثم أمر بهم فجهزوا فأصلح إليهم وأخرجوا إلى المدينة

Abu Al-Zanba' Ruh ibn Al-Faraj Al-Misri narrated to us, saying: Yahya ibn Bukayr narrated to us, and he said: Al-Layth narrated to me, saying: Al-Husayn ibn 'Ali (may Allah be pleased with them both) refused to surrender, so they fought him and killed him, along with his two sons and his companions who fought alongside him, at a place called Al-Taff.

'Ali ibn Al-Husayn, Fatimah bint Al-Husayn, and Sukaynah bint Al-Husayn were taken to 'Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyad. At that time, 'Ali was a young boy who had reached the age of maturity. They were then sent to Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah. Yazid ordered that Sukaynah be placed behind his throne so that she would not see the head of her father and her relatives. 'Ali ibn Al-Husayn (may Allah be pleased with them both) was in chains.

Yazid placed Al-Husayn's head and struck his teeth, saying:

"We split the heads of men dear to us,

But they were the most disobedient and oppressive."

'Ali ibn Al-Husayn (may Allah be pleased with them both) replied, reciting the verse: "No calamity befalls on the earth or in yourselves but it is inscribed in the Book before We bring it into existence. Verily, that is easy for Allah." (Surah Al-Hadid: 22)

This made Yazid uneasy, and he recited a line of poetry. 'Ali responded with a verse from the Book of Allah, the Exalted. Yazid said: "Rather, it is because of what your hands have earned, but He pardons much." (Surah Ash-Shura: 30)

'Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) said: "By Allah, if the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) saw us in chains, he would love to free us from them." Yazid said: "You have spoken the truth." So, they were released from the chains.

'Ali added: "If we were to stand before the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) from a distance, he would love to bring us closer." Yazid said: "You have spoken the truth." They were brought closer, and Fatimah and Sukaynah started to stretch to see the head of their father, while Yazid tried to hide it by stretching himself in his seat to block their view.

After this, he ordered that they be prepared and sent back to Madinah, treating them well and ensuring their provisions were sufficient.[501]

Another Sunni hadith collector, Imam Ali ibn Abu Bakr al-Haythami (d. 807 H) also documents this narration and then writes about it:

---

[501] Abu'l Qawsim Sulayman Ibn Ahmad at-Tabarani, *Mu'jam al-Kabir* (Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyyah) [annotator: Abdul-Majeed al-Salafi], vol. 3, page 109, hadith No. 2608

رواه الطبراني (مص: ٣٤٣) و رجاله ثقات

Narrated by al-Tabarani and it (hadith)'s narrators are trustworthies.[502]

It is regrettable that some individuals can still stand to defend vicious people like Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah, Ubayd Allah bin Ziyad, Umar ibn Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas and host of others who murdered the family of their Prophet. We say "La haola wala quwata illah billah."

CRYING FOR THE MARTYRS OF KAR'BALA

Question 67:

Why do you wail for the death of Hussain on the Day of Ashura? Why don't you remember the death of Al-Hassan? You say he has more value and honor than Hussain. Why don't you wail for the death of their father, Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu? Why don't you even wail for the death of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam? Who has ever heard the Shi'ites wail for the death of the Noble Prophet? But why are you annually wailing for Hussain?

Question 68:

Why is it that in your books, lectures, and websites, when discussing the issue of wailing for the death of Hussain, you don't mention his brothers and relatives who were martyred in Karbala?

In your books, you also confirm that he was not the only one martyred. In "Al-Irshad" by Mufid (pp. 194), "Muntahal A'amal" (1/240), and "Jalalul Uyun" by Majlisi (pp. 528), it is reported that Abu Bakr bin Ali bin Abi Talib, Umar bin Ali bin Abi Talib, Uthman bin Ali bin Abi Talib, Abu Bakr bin Hassan bin Ali bin Abi Talib, and

---

[502] Ali ibn Abi Bakr al-Haythami, *Majmau al-Zawaid* (Saudi: Dar al-Manhaj, 1st Edition, 1436 H) [annotators: Husein Salim Asad ad-Darani], vol. 18, page 562 - 563, hadith No. 15142

Umar bin Hussain bin Ali bin Abi Talib were all martyred at Karbala. Why don't you mention their names? Is it because of their names or something else?

Question 69:

If all the wails and bloodshed you engage in during your mourning are part of the religion, why don't you do it for the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam? Why didn't Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, do such wailing during the death of his wife? Why didn't he also do it during the death of the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam?

Question 70:

The annual wailing on the Day of Ashura—is it a Prophetic narration or an innovation? But before your answer, let's go through some of your books.

THE REPLY

First, whoever is closer to the Shi'ah [Majalis – gatherings] will discovered they are the only Muslims who observe and remember various Islamic events and occasions throughout the year: from Mawlid [days of birth] of the members of Ahl al-Bayt, to the commemoration of the day of their martyrdom, and so on.

Second, without even going into the traditions of the noble Prophet, the gruesome killing of the members of the Prophet's household led by al-Husein was unprecedented; and it is not really the killings that is being remembered yearly but the revival of Islam amidst innovations and kufr; the rise for justice and equity as against injustice and inequity; the fight for liberation and freedom as against oppression and tyranny. Imam al-Husein himself is reported to have said:

إِنِّي لَمْ أَخْرُجْ أَشِرًا وَلا بَطَرًا وَلا مُفْسِدًا وَلا ظالِمًا وَإِنَّما خَرَجْتُ لِطَلَبِ الْإِصْلاحِ فى أُمَّةِ جَدّى، أُرِيدُ أَنْ آمُرَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَأَنْهى عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَأَسِيرَ بِسِيرَةِ جَدّى وَأَبى عَلِيِّ بْنِ أَبِيطالِب

I did not rise up for the cause of wickedness, amusement, corruption or oppression, but I rose up to reform the Muslim community of my grandfather [Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)] and my father Ali ibn Abi Taalib. I want to promote virtue and prevent vice.

FROM THE SUNNAH OF THE NOBLE PROPHET

Many Sahabah and households of the Prophet died during his [peace be upon him and his progeny] blessed lifetime, and he even foretold the killing of some Sahabah like our master Ammar ibn Yassir, and even member of his family like his beloved daughter Hazrat Fatima az-Zahra. However, none of these [death] received more attention and deep sorrow from the Prophet as the martyrdom of al-Husein. We read in recurrent [Mutawattir] hadith that angels used to visit the noble Prophet and console him of what will happened to his grandson al-Husein; and the noble Prophet used to cry and mourn the killing of al-Husein. Let us cite few ahadith.

Imam Ahmad documents:

حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي أَبِي ، قثنا وَكِيعٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ ، أَوْ أُمِّ سَلَمَةَ قَالَ وَكِيعٌ شَكَّ هُوَ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ لِإِحْدَاهُمَا لَقَدْ دَخَلَ عَلَيَّ الْبَيْتَ مَلَكٌ لَمْ يَدْخُلْ عَلَيَّ قَبْلَهَا ، فَقَالَ لِي إِنَّ ابْنَكَ هَذَا حُسَيْنٌ مَقْتُولٌ فَإِنْ شِئْتَ آتِيكَ مِنْ تُرْبَةِ الْأَرْضِ الَّتِي يُقْتَلُ بِهَا قَالَ فَأَخْرَجَ إِلَيَّ تُرْبَةً حَمْرَاءَ

Abdullah (ibn Ahmad) – my father (Ahmad ibn Hanbal) – Waki – Abd Allah ibn Sa'eed – his father – from Aisha or Umm Salamah; Waki says, "I can't remember which one:" The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, "An angel that has

never visited me before came into the house today. He (the angel) told me: This son of yours Hussein will be killed. If you wish I can give you the soil of that earth which he will die in. He (the Prophet) said, "He then brought me a soil that was red."[503]

Annotator's comment: The chain of this narration is authentic (Sahih).

Imam Abi Ya'la al-Mawsili also documents:

عن عبد الله بن نجي عن أبيه، إنه سار مع علي كرم الله وجهه وكان صاحب مطهرته، فلما حاذى نينوى وهو منطلق إلى صفين فنادى علي: إصبر أبا عبد الله! إصبر أبا عبد الله بشط الفرات! قلت وماذا؟ قال: دخلت على النبي (ص) ذات يوم وعيناه تفيضان قلت: يا نبي الله، أغضبك أحد؟ ما شأن عينيك تفيضان؟ قال: بل قام عندي جبريل فحدثني أن الحسين يقتل بشط الفرات. قال فقال: هل لك أن أشمك من تربته؟ قال قلت: نعم. فمد يده فقبض قبضة من تراب فأعطانيها فلم أملك عيني أن فاضتا

Abdullah ibn Nujiyy who heard from his father. He says:

We went with 'Ali, they faced Naynawaa since they were going to the battle of Siffin. Then 'Ali called out: Have patience Oh Aba Abdillah! Have patience Oh Aba Abdillah, on the banks of Euphrates! I said, "What do you mean 'Oh Aba Abdillah?" He (Ali) said, "I went into the

---

[503] Ahmad ibn Hanbal, *Fadha'il Sahabah* (Umm al-Qura University, Makkah Mukaramah, Ibn Jawzi publication, 3rd edition, 1426 H) [annotator: Wasiyullah ibn Muhammad Abbas], vol. 2, pg.965, #1357

The annotator of the book writes: He (Ahmad ibn Hanbal) has brought this hadith in his Musnad and also Haythami in 'Majma al-Zawaid and has said: 'Ahmad has reported this hadith and its narrators are sahih" and Tabarani has brought this hadith from Aishah and Ahmad has mentioned it. And in Majma al-Zawaid, it is mentioned: "Ahmad has narrated this and Abu Ya'la and Tabarani and al-Bazzar, and its narrators are all Thiqat [trustworthy]

room with the Prophet, peace be upon him, one day and his eyes were gushing with tears. I said, Oh Prophet, 'Did somebody anger you? What makes your eyes gush with tears? He said, "No, Jibril just left me now." He (Jubril) informed me that Hussein will be killed on the banks of the Euphrates river. Then he (Jubril) said to him, "Shall I let you smell the soil (in which he will die)?" He (the Prophet) said, "Yes". He (Jubril) folded his hand, took a handful of the soil and gave it to me. Since then, I couldn't control my eyes from the gushing of tears.[504]

Annotator's comment: The chain of the narration is good.

Imam Abi Ya'la al-Mawsili again documents:

Abd al-Samad bin Ihsan – Ammar (Ibn Zadan) – Thabit – Anas (ibn Malik):

حدثنا عبد الصمد بن حسان ، ثنا عمارة ، يعني ابن زاذان ، عن ثابت ، عن أنس قال استأذن ملك القطر أن يأتي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فأذن له ، فقال لأم سلمة احفظي علينا الباب لا يدخل أحد . فجاء الحسين بن علي فوثب حتى دخل ، فجعل يصعد على منكب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ، فقال له الملك أتحبه ؟ قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم نعم. قال فإن أمتك تقتله ، وإن شئت أريتك المكان الذي يقتل فيه. قال فضرب بيده ، فأراه ترابا أحمر ، فأخذت أم سلمة ذلك التراب ، فصرته في طرف ثوبها . قال : فكنا نسمع يقتل بكربلاء

---

[504] Abi Ya'la Mawsili, *Musnad* (Maktab Rushd: Dar al-Mamun li Turath, 1st edition, 1430 H) [annotator: Hussein Salim Asad], vol. 1, pg. 298, Hadith No.363; Sahih Ibn Hibban (Muassasat al-Risalah) [annotator: Shuaib al-Ar'naut], vol.5, pg.142, Hadith 6742.

The annotator of the book also writes: "Haythami has mentioned it in Majma al-Zawa'id. Also, Ahmad has narrated it as well as Abu Ya'la and Bazzar and Tabarani and the narrators (of the hadith) are trustworthy."

The angel of rain asked his Lord permission to visit the Prophet, peace be upon him. He gave (the angel) permission and this day he (the Prophet) was with Umm Salamah, the mother of Believers. The Prophet told her, "Guard the door and do not let anyone come in."

He said: "While she was at the door, Hussein ibn Ali burst into the room. So the Prophet began to hug him and kiss him. The angel said: 'Do you love him?' He (the Prophet) said: "Yes". The angel said: "Your Ummah (nation) will kill him." He said: "If you wish, I will show you the place in which they will kill him." So he took a handful of soil from the place in which he will be killed and he showed it. It was "Sahla" or red soil.' So Umm Salamah took it, and collected it on her clothes.

Thaabit says: "We would say that it was from Karbala."[505]

Commentator says: In Musnad Ahmad, it says, "he struck his hand and brought red sand." [Annotator's comment]: The chain is good.

---

[505] Imam Abi Ya'la Mawsili, *Musnad* (Maktab Rushd: Dar al-Mamun li Turath, 1st edition, 1430 H) [annotator: Hussein Salim Asad], vol. 6, pg. 129, Hadith No.3402

The annotator writes: Ahmad has narrated it and Abu Na'eem in "Dalaail al-Nubuwah" and Ahmad has narrated it with two chains. Al-Haythami has mentioned in Majma al-Zawa'id saying: Ahmad has narrated it and Abu Ya'la and Bazzar and Tabarani with chains including "Imarah Ibn Zaathaan and a group of scholars have deemed him trustworthy. In him there is weakness (according to verifier) and the rest of the narrators of Abu Ya'la are all sahih.

THE NOBLE PROPHET ON THE DAY OF ASHURA

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal and Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir document:

Ibrahim ibn Abd Allah al-Basri – Hajaaj – Hamaad (ibn Salamah) – Ammar ibn Abi Ammar – Ibn Abbas:

حدثنا إبراهيم بن عبد الله البصري ، نا حجاج ، نا حماد ، قثنا عمار بن أبي عمار ، عن ابن عباس قال : « رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فيما يرى النائم بنصف النهار أغبر أشعث بيده قارورة فيها دم ، فقلت : بأبي وأمي يا رسول الله ، ما هذا ؟ قال : هذا دم الحسين وأصحابه لم أزل منذ اليوم ألتقطه فأحصى ذلك اليوم فوجدوه قتل يومئذ »

I saw the Prophet, peace be upon him, in my dreams during mid-day. He was dusty and disheveled and he was holding a bottle of blood. I said: Let my father and mother be sacrificed for you, O Messenger of Allah, what is that? He, peace be upon him, said: This is the blood of Al-Hussein and his companions. I have been collecting it since day-time.

Ammar said: "We memorized that day and then we found he (Al-Hussein) was killed on the same date."[506]

---

[506] Ibn Kathir, *al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya* [annotator: Dr. Abdullah Abdul Muhsin al-Turki] (Publisher: A'alam Al-kutub Institutions), vol. 2, page 573.

The annotator of Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, Sheikh al-Ar'naut writes: The chain of narration is strong according to the conditions set by Muslim.

And he also says: Al-Tabarani narrated it in Hadith no.2822 and 12837, al-Hakim al-Naysaburi narrated it in al-Mustadrak vol. 4, pg.397 – 398 from Hammad ibn Salama with this chain, and al-Hakim authenticated it according to the conditions set by Muslim, and al-Dhahabi agreed with it.

Ibn Kathir comments: The chain of narration is Qawi (strong).

Also, Imam Hakim al-Naysaburi documents:

أخبرني أبو القاسم الحسن بن محمد السكوني ، بالكوفة ، ثنا محمد بن عبد الله الحضرمي ، ثنا أبو كريب ، ثنا أبو خالد الأحمر ، حدثني زريق ، حدثني سلمان ، قال : دخلت على أم سلمة ، وهي تبكي فقلت: ما يبكيك ؟ قالت : رأيت رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم - في المنام يبكي وعلى رأسه ولحيته التراب ، فقلت: ما لك يا رسول الله ؟ قال: شهدت قتل الحسين آنفا

Narrated to us Abu al-Qasim al-Hasan ibn Muhammad al-Sukuni in Kufa – Muhammad ibn Abd Allah al-Hadrami – Abu Karib – Abu Khalid al-Aamar – Zurayq:

Narrated Salman who said: I entered upon Umm Salamah while she was crying, so I said: What causes you to cry? She said: I saw the Messenger of Allah – that is, in a dream – and there was was dirt on his head and his beard. So, I said: "What is wrong with you, O Messenger of Allah?" He said: I just witnessed the killing of Al-Husain."[507]

These are a few of many narrations relating to the news and reactions of the Prophet to the killing of al-Husein. Therefore, if the Shi'ah emulate the noble Prophet by mourning the death of al-Husein and his sahabah, is that not from his blessed Sunnah?!

Apart from the fact that the commemoration of the martyrdom of al-Husein awakens the heart and instill the Islamic revolutionary thought of abiding by the truth, justice and equity; and never to bow to tyranny, injustice and innovation, it also signifies the deep love for al-Husein.

Imam al-Tirmidhi documents:

---

[507] Abu Abdullah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *al-Mustadrak ala Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Alamiyah) [annotator: Mustafah Abd al-Qadri 'Ata], vol. 4, pg. 20, hadith no. 2362/6764.

حَدَّثَنَا الْحَسَنُ بْنُ عَرَفَةَ، حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمَاعِيلُ بْنُ عَيَّاشٍ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عُثْمَانَ بْنِ خُثَيْمٍ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ رَاشِدٍ، عَنْ يَعْلَى بْنِ مُرَّةَ، قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم: حُسَيْنٌ مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْ حُسَيْنٍ أَحَبَّ اللَّهُ مَنْ أَحَبَّ حُسَيْنًا

Narrated Yala bin Murrah:

that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: "Husain is from me, and I am from Husain. Allah loves whoever loves Husain."[508]

Generally, whoever cries and feels remorse for the calamities that befell the Ahl al-Bayt, paradise awaits him, and that is a monumental reward.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal documents:

حدثنا أحمد بن إسرائيل قال رأيت في كتاب أحمد بن محمد بن حنبل رحمه الله بخط يده نا اسود بن عامر أبو عبد الرحمن قثنا الربيع بن منذر عن أبيه قال : كان حسين بن علي يقول من دمعتا عيناه فينا دمعة أو قطرت عيناه فينا قطرة اثواه الله عز و جل الجنة

Narrated al-Rabi' b. Munzir:

Husayn b. 'Ali used to say: Anyone whose eyes are filled with tears for our sake, or tears drop from his eyes for our sake, Allah the Almighty, the Most Glorious will reward him with the Paradise.[509]

Of course, the hadith is absolutely authentic [Sahih].

Lastly, it is well established in Shi'ah authentic ahadith that every mourning should not be more than three days except that of al-Husein. This is understandable when one observes the lenghy period the noble Prophet himself used to mourn al-Husein. Why is the case of al-Husein different? Indeed, only Allah and His Prophet know the secret behind his case. And it is a fallacy per excellence that not all the

---

[508] Sunan al-Tirmidhi, English reference: Vol. 1, Book 46, Hadith 3775; Arabic reference: Book 49, Hadith 4144. https://sunnah.com/urn/636580

[509] Ahmad ibn Hanbal al-Shaybani, *Kitab Fada'il al-Sahabah* (Saudi: Dar al-'ilm Li-Tab'ah wal-Nashr; 1st Edition, 1403 H) [annotator: Wasiyullah ibn Muhammad Abbas], vol. 1, pg. 675 – 676, hadith no. 1154

martyrs of Karbala are remembered and commemorated. Each martyr has his or her own Ziyarat as stated in various Shi'ah books of Ziyarat.

Peace be upon al-Husein

Peace be upon Ali ibn al-Husein

Peace be upon the children of al-Husein

Peace be upon the companions of al-Husein, those who sacrifice their all for al-Husein.

NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH [TEMPORARY MARRIAGE]

CHAPTER FOURTY THREE

NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH [TEMPORARY MARRIAGE]

Question 71:

If you go through Shi'ite books, you will see wonders in the virtue of temporary marriage. They describe it as having much and unquantifiable reward for whoever practices it. It is classified as part of the practice of the "Imams" (leaders). You, the Shi'ites, further equate the virtue of whoever practices it to the virtue of Hussain, Radiyallahu Anhu; if practiced twice, one has a virtue like that of Al-Hassan, Radiyallahu Anhu. If practiced three times, one has the virtue of Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu; while by practicing it four times, one attains the virtue of the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam. Fathullah al-Kashani reported this tradition in the book "Tafsiru Manhajis Sadiqina" (2/198).

In the book "Man La Yahduruhul Faqih," one of the four most authentic books to Shi'ites, it was reported that Abu Abdullah Ja'far Sadiq said: "Temporary marriage is my religion; it is also the religion of my forefathers. Whoever practices it has embraced and follows our religion."

In the above book (3/356), he was asked about the reward for someone who practices temporary marriage and whether it is certain. He replied: "If he embarks on a temporary marriage anticipating reward from Allah, whatever he says to her is a reward... If he comes closer to her, his sins will be forgiven. If he satisfies his emotions and proceeds to have a ritual bath, any drop of water amounts to his forgiveness."

Don't be deceived by their notion that "Mut'ah," or temporary marriage, is a cure or alternative for bachelors. Khumaini, in his book "Tahrirul Wasilah," states that one can practice it with a baby who is still breastfeeding from her mother's breast. One can hug her, place his penis between her thighs, kiss her, and satisfy his emotions with her! If she is up to seven years old, you can do anything and everything with her! Majlisi, in his book "Biharul Anwar" (100/312), states that in the process of this marriage there is no need for witnesses! A marriage for ten minutes! From the first union, you just proceed to pay dowry, then seclusion, and later have sexual relations. This automatically signifies the conclusion of a marital union—no witness, no announcement, nor gathering to validate the contract. There is no inheritance between them, no divorce, and no mourning after death.

What then is the difference with actions that are considered immoral or depraved? Imagine a society with this attitude! How can one have full confidence in the morality of his children, brothers, or even wife/wives? To be frank as a Shi'ite: would you be comfortable with your daughter practicing it? Or with your mother or sister being involved?

In the same book (3/366), they report a claim from a Prophetic narration as follows: "Whoever practices temporary marriage will be free from Allah's wrath; if practiced twice, he will be raised on the Day of Resurrection among the righteous; if practiced thrice, we will be together racing to enter Paradise."

Our 72nd question concerns the meaning of the hadith reported in "Biharul Anwar" (100/308) when Abu Abdullah was asked about temporary marriage; he said: "Don't filth yourself with it."

Furthermore, what is the meaning of Ali's Radiyallahu Anhu statement reported in "Wasa'ilus Shi'ah" (21/12) when he heard Abdullah bin Abbas giving his opinion and verdict for practicing "Mut'ah"? He said to him: "You have gone astray," because the Noble Prophet prohibited it along with the consumption of donkey meat on the day of Khaybar.

THE REPLY

Technically, there is nothing like "question 71" rather what is submitted are bunch of "hadiths on merits of Mut'ah." Unfortunately, the Professor was so careless of his reputation that he never even bothered about what Shi'ah hadith experts say on all the ahadith quoted – as per their grading or meaning. Anyway, the aim of an antagonist is understandable, and that is to attack irrespective of the consequences.

However, before we talk about the ahadith, we need to prove the validity of Nikkah al-Mut'ah using Ahlu Sunnah's sources. It seemed the Professor also accepted the validity of Nikkah al-Mut'ah but with the belief that it has been prohibited. This is evident when he submits:

Furthermore, what is the meaning of Aliyu (Radiyallahu Anhu)'s saying that was reported in "Wasa'ilus Shi'ah" (21/12) when he heard Abdullah bin Abbas giving his opinion and verdict for practicing "Mut'ah" he said to him; "you gone astray." Because the Noble prophet has prohibited it and the consummation of the meat of donkey on the day of Khaybar.

VALIDITY OF NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH [TEMPORARY MARRIAGE]

There is no differences as to the fact that Nikkah al-Mut'ah was [at least once] part of Islam legislated by Allah via His Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny). The Shi'a-Sunni dichotomy in this case is whether Mut'ah practise was prohibited or not. Majority of Ahlu Sunnah maintained it was later prohibited by the Prophet while the Shi'ah (and very few Ahlu Sunnah) argued otherwise, that its validity remains till qiyamat. This is the basis.

Imam Muslim documents:

Abdullah (b. Mas'ud) reported:

We were on an expedition with Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and we had no women with us. We said: Should we not have ourselves castrated? He (the Holy

Prophet) forbade us to do so. He then granted us permission that we should contract temporary marriage for a stipulated period giving her a garment, and Abdullah then recited this verse: Those who believe do not make unlawful the good things which Allah has made lawful for you, and do not transgress. Allah does not like trangressers" (al-Qur'an, v. 87).[510]

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ نُمَيْرٍ الْهَمْدَانِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا أَبِي وَوَكِيعٌ، وَابْنُ، بِشْرٍ عَنْ إِسْمَاعِيلَ، عَنْ قَيْسٍ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ، يَقُولُ كُنَّا نَغْزُو مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لَيْسَ لَنَا نِسَاءٌ فَقُلْنَا أَلاَ نَسْتَخْصِي فَنَهَانَا عَنْ ذَلِكَ ثُمَّ رَخَّصَ لَنَا أَنْ نَنْكِحَ الْمَرْأَةَ بِالثَّوْبِ إِلَى أَجَلٍ ثُمَّ قَرَأَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ { يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لاَ تُحَرِّمُوا طَيِّبَاتِ مَا أَحَلَّ اللَّهُ لَكُمْ وَلاَ تَعْتَدُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ لاَ يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ} .

The above hadith established the following points:

- Prophet legislated Mut'ah
- Mut'ah is a marriage contract between a man and a woman
- The marriage is temporary (for a fixed time)
- Dower is also paid

Therefore, it is ignorance to argue that nikkah al-Mut'ah is alien to Islam or was Shi'ah innovation as some compound ignorants among the Sunni used to say in their desperate bid to oppose the Shi'ah by all means possible. Furthermore, some of the Shi'ah antagonists had even labelled Mut'ah as Zina [fornication or adultery], and the consequence of such ill-thought is that Allah and His

---

[510] Sahih Muslim 1404 a; In-book reference : Book 16, Hadith 13USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 8, Hadith 3243 https://sunnah.com/muslim/16/13

Messenger [at least once] approved "Zina." And "Say: Surely Allah does not enjoin indecency..."[511]

MUT'AH IN THE BOOK OF ALLAH

Our Lord says in His glorious book

فَمَا اسْتَمْتَعْتُم بِهِ مِنْهُنَّ فَآتُوهُنَّ أُجُورَهُنَّ فَرِيضَةً

"...Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries as appointed..."[512]

Al-hafiz ibn Kathir [a die-hard Sunni] in his tafsir under the above verse devoted his time to prove the prohibition of Nikkah Mut'a but left us this important note among others. He states:

وقد استدل بعموم هذه الآية على نكاح المتعة ، ولا شك أنه كان مشروعا في ابتداء الإسلام, ثم نسخ بعد ذلك...

"The general meaning of this verse was inferred to the Nikkah al-Mut'ah, and no doubt it was legitimated in the beginning of Islam, then was abrogated...."

Ibn Kathir further documents:

وقد روي عن ابن عباس وطائفة من الصحابة القول بإباحتها للضرورة ، وهو رواية عن الإمام أحمد بن حنبل ، رحمهم الله تعالى وكان ابن عباس ، وأبي بن كعب ، وسعيد بن جبير ، والسدي يقرءون : فما استمتعتم به منهن إلى أجل مسمى فآتوهن أجورهن فريضة وقال مجاهد : نزلت في نكاح المتعة

"From Ibn Abbas and a group of Sahaba who narrated the statement of the legalization of its necessity (i.e nikkah al-Mut'ah), (with) a narration from Imam Ahmad ibn

---

[511] Surah al-A'raf: 28
[512] Surah an-Nisa: 24

Hanbal, may Allaah bless them. Ibn Abbas, Ubay ibn kaab, Saeed bin Jubayr and Al-Sudi used to read (the verse as): 'Then as to those whom you do mut'ah with FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD, give them their dowries as appointed.' Mujahid said: It (the verse) was revealed about nikkah al-mut'ah."[513]

Imam Muslim further documents another hadith:

Jabir b. Abdullah reported:

We used to contract temporary marriage giving a handful of (tales or flour as a dower) during the lifetime of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and durnig the time of Abu Bakr until Umar forbade it in the case of Amr b. Huraith.[514]

حَدَّثَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ رَافِعٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ، أَخْبَرَنَا ابْنُ جُرَيْجٍ، أَخْبَرَنِي أَبُو الزُّبَيْرِ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ جَابِرَ بْنَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، يَقُولُ كُنَّا نَسْتَمْتِعُ بِالْقُبْضَةِ مِنَ التَّمْرِ وَالدَّقِيقِ الأَيَّامَ عَلَى عَهْدِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَأَبِي بَكْرٍ حَتَّى نَهَى عَنْهُ عُمَرُ فِي شَأْنِ عَمْرِو بْنِ حُرَيْثٍ

So, Abdullah ibn Abbas, Ubayy ibn Kaab, Jabir ibn Abdullah and a group of other sahabah, and from the tabi'een the likes of Saeed Ibn Jubayr and al-Sudi affirmed the legality of Nikkah al-Mut'ah and even read the verse with an interpretative phrase "for a temporary period."

In fact, according to al-Qur'tubi in his tafsir[515] , MAJORITY are of the opinion that this verse was revealed for nikkah Mut'ah legalization although he like Ibn Kathir

---

[513] Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem [Dar Tayyibat, 1422 H], part 8; under sura Nisa verse 24.

[514] Sahih Muslim 1405 dIn-book reference : Book 16, Hadith 19USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 8, Hadith 3249. https://www.sunnah.com/muslim/16/19

[515] Abi Abdillah Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Abi Bakr al-Qur'tubi, *al-Jami al-Ahkam al-Qur'an* [annotator: Dr. Abdullah b. Abd al-Muhsin al-Tur'ki] (Mu'asassat ar-Risalah), vol. 6, pg 215

following their Sunni dogma believed the nikkah was later abrogated.

WAS NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH ABROGATED?

The claim of the majority of Ahlu Sunnah is that, 'yes, nikkah al-Mut'ah was once legislated and the sahabah practised it but the Prophet later prohibited it.' Evidence of this is the saying of al-Hafiz ibn Kathir when he says, "The whole of this verse has been cited for the Nikkah al-Mut'ah, no doubt it was legitimated in the beginning of Islam, then was abrogated..."

On the contrary, the Shi'a believe that Nikkah al-Mut'ah was never abrogated and its practice continues till the day of judgement.

QUALITY OF BOTH SIDES OF THE ARGUMENT

THE AHLU SUNNAH

- Some Ahlu Sunnah scholars ascribing an hadith to Umm al-Mu'mineen Aishah who argued that verses 1 – 6 of surah al-Muminun has abrogated the verse (in verse 24 of surah an-Nisa) that legislated nikkah al-Mut'ah
- The hadith of Rabi' Ibn Sabra[516] who reported that he saw the Prophet who prohibited nikkah al-Mut'ah on the day of victory (8th year of Hijrah when Makkah was conquered) after allowing it for three (3) days. Another version of this hadith claims it was at the night of Awtas. Ahlu Sunnah scholars claimed it was the same period.
- The hadith of Ali ibn Abi Talib

Imam Muslim [book 16 hadith 37; book 8 hadith 3266] documents: Ali (Allah be pleased with him) heard that Ibn Abbas (Allah be pleased with them) gave some relaxation in connection with the contracting of temporary marriage, whereupon he said: Don't be hasty (in your religious

---

[515] Abi Abdillah Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Abi Bakr al-Qur'tubi, *al-Jami al-Ahkam al-Qur'an* [annotator: Dr. Abdullah b. Abd al-Muhsin al-Tur'ki] (Mu'asassat ar-Risalah), vol. 6, pg 215

verdict), Ibn Abbas, for Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) on the Day of Khaybar prohibited that forever - along with the eating of flesh of domestic asses.

The above are the three "weighty evidences" of Ahlu Sunnah to prove the prohibition of nikkah al-Mut'ah. The last point was exactly what the Professor also brought when he says:

Furthermore, what is the meaning of Aliyu's Radiyallahu Anhu saying that was reported in "Wasa'ilus Shi'ah" (21/12) when he heard Abdullah bin Abbas giving his opinion and verdict for practicing "Mut'ah" he said to him; "you gone astray." Because the Noble prophet has prohibited it and the consummation of the meat of donkey on the day of Khaybar.

THE SHI'AH RESPONSE

- The noble (verses 1 – 6 of) surah al-Mu'minun usually cited by the Ahlu Sunnah to have abrogated nikah al-Mut'ah was revealed in Makkah whereas the verse that legislated nikkah al-Mut'ah was revealed years later in Madinah. For a fact, a Makkan verse cannot abrogate a Madinah verse; likewise, an initial or a former verse cannot abrogate a later "new" verse. Allah says in His glorious book:

مَا نَنسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلِهَا أَلَمْ تَعْلَمْ أَنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

Whatever verse We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring one better than it or like it. Do you not know that Allah has power over all things? [al-Baqarah: 106]

- Also, with a single swift, verse 106 of al-Baqarah and verse 101 of surah al-Nahl established that only a verse of the Qur'an can abrogate another verse (with the stated rule). The implication of this is that no hadith can abrogate a verse of the Qur'an. Therefore, the ahadith that were ascribed to Ibn

Sabra and Ali ibn Abi Talib are nothing but desperation of our Ahlu Sunnah brethren to ascribe the prohibition to the Prophet.

- On the hadith ascribed to Ali ibn Abi Talib, following points exposed its fallacy:

Abdullah ibn Umar[517] , Jabir Ibn Abdillah[518] , Anas ibn Malik[519] and Zahir Al-Aslami;[520] all of these companions reported that what the Prophet actually prohibited at Khaybar was the eating of donkey. None of them reported Mut'ah prohibition. Why only Ali's hadith had "mut'ah prohibition" alongside the prohibition of donkey of others? Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani saves us time and writes on the fabricated hadith ascribed to Ali Ibn Abi Talib. He says:

قال السهيلي : ويتصل بهذا الحديث تنبيه على إشكال لأن فيه النهي عن نكاح المتعة يوم خيبر ، وهذا شيء لا يعرفه أحد من أهل السير ورواة الأثر ، قال : فالذي يظهر أنه وقع تقديم وتأخير في لفظ الزهري ، وهذا الذي قاله سبقه إليه غيره في النقل عن ابن عيينة ، فذكر ابن عبد البر من طريق قاسم بن أصبغ أن الحميدي ذكر عن ابن عيينة أن النهي زمن خيبر عن لحوم الحمر الأهلية ، وأما المتعة فكان في غير يوم خيبر ، ثم راجعت مسند الحميدي من طريق قاسم بن أصبغ عن أبي

---

[517] Sahih Bukhari 5521; In-book reference: Book 72, Hadith 48; USC-MSA web (English) reference: vol. 7 Book 67, Hadith 430. https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/72/48

[518] Sahih Bukhari 1405; In-book reference: Book 72, Hadith 47; USC-MSA web (English) reference: vol. 7 Book 67, Hadith 429. https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/72/47

[519] Sahih Bukhari 4198; In-book reference: Book 64, Hadith 238; USC-MSA web (English) reference: vol. 5 Book 59, Hadith 510. https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/64/238

[520] Sahih Bukhari 4173; In-book reference: Book 64, Hadith 215; USC-MSA web (English) reference: vol. 5 Book 59, Hadith 491. https://www.sunnah.com/bukhari/64/215

إسماعيل السلمي عنه فقال بعد سياق الحديث : قال ابن عيينة : يعني أنه نهى عن لحوم الحمر الأهلية زمن خيبر ، ولا يعني نكاح المتعة قال ابن عبد البر : وعلى هذا أكثر الناس

وقال البيهقي : يشبه أن [ص: 74] يكون كما قال لصحة الحديث في أنه صلى الله عليه وسلم رخص فيها بعد ذلك ثم نهى عنها ، فلا يتم احتجاج علي إلا إذا وقع النهي أخيرا لتقوم به الحجة على ابن عباس . وقال أبو عوانة في صحيحه سمعت أهل العلم يقولون : معنى حديث علي أنه نهى يوم خيبر عن لحوم الحمر ، وأما المتعة فسكت عنها وإنما نهى عنها يوم الفتح اهـ

Al-Suhayli said: "This hadith highlights an issue because it mentions the prohibition of temporary marriage (mut'ah) on the day of Khaybar. However, none of the scholars of Seerah (Prophetic biography) or narrators of traditions have recorded such a thing. He said: It appears there was a transposition in the wording of Al-Zuhri. This explanation was also mentioned by others citing Ibn 'Uyaynah. Ibn Abd al-Barr transmitted, through the route of Qasim ibn Asbagh, that Al-Humaydi reported from Ibn 'Uyaynah that the prohibition during the time of Khaybar was regarding the consumption of the meat of domesticated donkeys. As for temporary marriage, it occurred at a different time, not on the day of Khaybar.

I then referred to Musnad al-Humaydi, through the route of Qasim ibn Asbagh from Abu Isma'il al-Sulami, and after narrating the hadith, Ibn 'Uyaynah clarified: 'The prohibition during the time of Khaybar referred to the meat of domesticated donkeys and did not pertain to temporary marriage.' Ibn Abd al-Barr commented: 'Most scholars hold this view.'

Al-Bayhaqi said: 'It seems correct, as the hadith is authentic, that the Prophet (peace be upon him) permitted temporary marriage after that and then prohibited it later. Therefore, Ali's argument would only be valid if the prohibition occurred last, thus providing evidence against Ibn Abbas.'

Abu Awana stated in his Sahih: 'I heard the scholars say that the meaning of Ali's hadith is that the prohibition on the day of Khaybar pertained to the meat of domesticated donkeys, while temporary marriage was not addressed at that time. It was only prohibited on the day of the Conquest (of Mecca)."[521]

Summary:

- Mut'ah was legalised by the Prophet of Allah
- A verse was revealed for its legalization
- Ahlu Sunnah's ahadith on Mut'ah prohibition are doctored.

WHO PROHIBITED NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH?

If the Prophet was not the prohibitor of Mut'ah, then who was? Imam Muslim gives us a hint.

Jabir b. Abdullah reported:

We used to contract temporary marriage giving a handful of (tales or flour as a dower) during the lifetime of Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and durnig the time of Abu Bakr until Umar forbade it in the case of Amr b. Huraith.

حَدَّثَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ رَافِعٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ، أَخْبَرَنَا ابْنُ جُرَيْجٍ، أَخْبَرَنِي أَبُو الزُّبَيْرِ، قَالَ سَمِعْتُ جَابِرَ بْنَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، يَقُولُ كُنَّا نَسْتَمْتِعُ بِالْقُبْضَةِ

---

[521] Fath al-Bari sharh sahih al-bukhari (Dar al-rayan lil tarath; 1407 H), bab Kitab Nikah; footnote number 1, p. 74, hadith #4825
http://www.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?bk_no=52&ID=&idfrom=9350&idto=9355&bookid=52&startno=0

مِنَ التَّمْرِ وَالدَّقِيقِ الأَيَّامَ عَلَى عَهْدِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَأَبِي بَكْرٍ حَتَّى نَهَى عَنْهُ عُمَرُ فِي شَأْنِ عَمْرِو بْنِ حُرَيْث

Interestingly, there are two Sunni athar (narrations) ascribed to Umar ibn al-Khattab who allegedly quoted the noble Prophet while he forbade Mut'ah during his reign. Unfortunately, both of these athar are very weak (da'eef jiddan) athar and of no probative value. Meanwhile, Imam Ibn Abd ar-Razzaq gives more insight to what transpired in the case of Sahabi Amr ibn Hurayth. He documents:

عبد الرزاق ، عن ابن جريج قال : أخبرني أبو الزبير ، أنه سمع جابر بن عبد الله يقول : قدم عمرو بن حريث من الكوفة فاستمتع بمولاة ، فأتي بها عمر وهي حبلى فسألها ، فقالت : استمتع بي عمرو بن حريث فسأله ، فأخبره بذلك أمرا ظاهرا .قال : فهلا غيرها فذلك حين نهى عنها. قال ابن جريج : وأخبرني من أصدق أن عليا ، قال بالكوفة : لولا ما سبق من رأي عمر بن الخطاب - أو قال : من رأي ابن الخطاب - لأمرت بالمتعة ، ثم ما زنا إلا شقي

'Abd al-Razzāq – Ibn Jurayj – Abū al-Zubayr – Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh:

'Amr b. Ḥurayth arrived from Kūfah and did mut'ah with a slave woman. Then, she was brought to 'Umar when she became pregnant, and he interrogated her. So, she said, "'Amr b. Ḥurayth did mut'ah with me." Then, he interrogated him, and he informed him through that of an apparent matter." He said, "So, why not other than her?" That was the moment when he forbade it.

Ibn Jurayj said: And it is narrated to me from Asdaq from Ali who said (while) in Kufa: 'If not for what 'Umar has

said in forbidden mut'ah, none would have committed zinā except a wretched person."[522]

Imam Tabari also documents this:

حدثنا محمد بن المثنى قال : حدثنا محمد بن جعفر قال : حدثنا شعبة ، عن الحكم قال : سألته عن هذه الآية : والمحصنات من النساء إلا ما ملكت أيمانكم إلى هذا الموضع : فما استمتعتم به منهن ، أمنسوخة هي ؟ قال : لا ، قال الحكم : وقال علي رضي الله عنه : لولا أن عمر رضي الله عنه نهى عن المتعة ما زنى إلا شقي .

Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā – Muḥammad b. Ja'far – Shu'bah:

I asked al-Ḥakam concerning this verse {Also [forbidden for marriage are] women already married, except those whom your right hands possess} up till {Those of them with whom you contract mut'ah} [4:24], "Is it abrogated?" He said, "NO".

Al-Ḥākam said: "'Alī, may Allāh be pleased with him, said: 'If 'Umar, may Allāh be pleased with him, had not forbidden mut'ah, none would have committed zinā except a wretched person.[523]

Summary:

- Nikkah al-Mut'ah was practised by the sahabah during the lifetime of the Prophet
- Nikkah al-Mut'ah was practised by the sahabh during the reign of Abu Bakr and Umar until Umar forbade it in the case of a Sahabi who impregnated a slave girl

---

[522] Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Razzāq b. Hamām al-Ṣa'nānī, *al-Muṣannaf* [annotator: Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī], vol. 7, p. 500, # 14029

[523] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. Yazīd b. Kathīr b. Ghālib al-Āmulī al-Ṭabarī, Jāmi al-Bayān fī Tāwīl al-Qur'ān (Dār al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Ṣidqī Jamīl al-'Aṭṭār], vol. 5, p. 19

- Jabir Ibn Abdullah al-Ansari and Ali Ibn Abi Talib both testified that it was Umar ibn al-Khattab that prohibited Mut'ah.

Imam Malik Ibn Anas further reveals yet another scene.

Yahya related to me from Malik from Ibn Shihab from Urwa ibn az- Zubayr that Khawla ibn Hakim came to Umar ibn al-Khattab and said, "Rabia ibn Umayya made a temporary marriage with a woman and she is pregnant by him." Umar ibn al-Khattab went out in dismay dragging his cloak, saying, "This temporary marriage, had I come across it, I would have ordered stoning and done away with it![524]

وَحَدَّثَنِي عَنْ مَالِكٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ، عَنْ عُرْوَةَ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ، أَنَّ خَوْلَةَ بِنْتَ حَكِيمٍ، دَخَلَتْ عَلَى عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ فَقَالَتْ إِنَّ رَبِيعَةَ بْنَ أُمَيَّةَ اسْتَمْتَعَ بِامْرَأَةٍ فَحَمَلَتْ مِنْهُ . فَخَرَجَ عُمَرُ بْنُ الْخَطَّابِ فَزِعًا يَجُرُّ رِدَاءَهُ فَقَالَ هَذِهِ الْمُتْعَةُ وَلَوْ كُنْتُ تَقَدَّمْتُ فِيهَا لَرَجَمْتُ

Rabia Ibn Umayya was yet, another companion of the Prophet. This revealed the extent at which nikah al-Mut'ah was practised after the demise of the Prophet.

One of Sunni grand Ulama, Imam Ibn Hazm (d.456H) gave us a beautiful summary thus:

وقد ثبت على تحليلها بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم جماعة من السلف - رضي الله عنهم - منهم من الصحابة - رضي الله عنهم - أسماء بنت أبي بكر الصديق ، وجابر بن عبد الله ، وابن مسعود وابن عباس ، ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان ، وعمرو بن حريث ، وأبو سعيد الخدري ، وسلمة ، ومعبد ابنا أمية بن خلف ورواه جابر بن عبد الله

---

[524] Malik ibn Anas, al-Muwatta; Bab kitab an-Nikah; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 28, Hadith 42; Arabic reference : Book 28, Hadith 1137; https://sunnah.com/urn/411690

عن جميع الصحابة مدة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومدة أبي بكر ، وعمر إلى قرب آخر خلافة عمر . واختلف في إباحتها عن ابن الزبير ، وعن علي فيها توقف وعن عمر بن الخطاب أنه إنما أنكرها إذا لم يشهد عليها عدلان فقط ، وأباحها بشهادة عدلين ومن التابعين : طاوس ، وعطاء ، وسعيد بن جبير ، وسائر فقهاء مكة أعزها الله

A group of the Salaf (predecessors), may Allah be pleased with them, were FIRM in declaring it (Mut'a) halal (permissible) AFTER the Messenger of Allah. Those of them from the Ṣaḥābah (R) were Asmā bint Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, Jābir b. 'Abd Allah, Ibn Mas'ud, Ibn 'Abbās, Mu'āwiyah b. Abī Sufyān, 'Amr b. Ḥurayth, Abū Sa'id al-Khudrī, and Salamah and Ma'bad – sons of Umayyah b. Khalaf..

Ibn al-Zubayr had contradictory opinions on its permissibility, while 'Alī expressed no opinion concerning it. It is narrated that 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb only denied it if two just people did not act as its witnesses, and he considered it permissible if two just people acted as witnesses to it. And among the Tabi'een were: Ṭāwūs,

'Aṭā, Sa'id b. Jubayr[525] , and the rest of the jurists of Makkah, may Allāh honour it.[526]

CONFUSED STATE

There is absolutely no where to hide for the Ahlu Sunnah knowing that lots of sahabah and their celebrated tabi'een performed Nikkah al-Mut'ah during the Prophet's, Abu Bakr's and Umar's reign until Umar forbade it of his own will. Were these sahabah and tabi'een, some of whom even had children as a result of it, committed adultery if Mut'ah is claimed to be zina? Were their children [born out of Mut'ah] "children of Zina?"

A pathetic answer of many Ahlu Sunnah is "perhaps the Prophet's prohibitions did not reach them." What an

---

[525] There is yet another desperate attempt by Ahlu Sunnah scholars with an athar (narration) about an alleged retraction from Mut'ah of Sa'id Ibn Jubayr. This athar is a fabrication with a severely defective chain of transmitter. On the other hand, Sa'id Ibn Jubayr was described in the following athar with regards to Mut'ah: Imam Abdur-Razzaq (d. 211 A.H) documents:

14020 عبد الرزاق ، عن ابن جريج قال : أخبرني عبد الله بن عثمان بن خثيم قال : كانت بمكة امرأة عراقية تنسك جميلة لها ابن يقال له : أبو أمية ، وكان سعيد بن جبير يكثر الدخول عليها ، قلت : يا أبا عبد الله ما أكثر ما تدخل على هذه المرأة قال : إنا قد نكحناها ذلك النكاح للمتعة قال : وأخبرني أن سعيدا ، قال له : هي أحل من شرب الماء ، للمتعة

'Abd al-Razzāq – Ibn Jurayj – 'Abd Allāh b. 'Uthmān b. Khaytham: There was a pious, beautiful Iraqī woman in Makkah. She had a son called Abū Umayyah; and Sa'd b. Jubayr used to enter upon her a lot. I said, "O Abū 'Abd Allāh! Why do you frequently enter upon this woman?" He said, "We have married her in that marriage", referring to mut'ah. He (Ibn Jurayj) said: He ('Abd Allāh) informed me that Sa'īd said to him: "**IT IS MORE ḤALĀL THAN THE DRINKING OF WATER**," referring to mut'ah."[Source: Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Razzāq b. Hamām al-Ṣa'nānī, al-Muṣannaf [annotator: Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī], vol. 7, p. 496, # 14020]

[526] Ibn Hazm, *al-Muḥallā* (Dār al-Fikr li al-Ṭabā"ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī), vol. 9, pp. 519-520

excuse! Prophet must have prohibited it inside his blessed grave that the alleged order did not reach them.

VIRTUES OF NIKKAH AL-MUT'AH

In famous and undisputable ahadith, the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) is reported to have said:

"Marriage is of my Sunnah, and whoever turns away from my Sunnah is not of me." "Whoever performs nikkah, he has completed half of his religion. To fulfil the other half, he should fear Allah."

The fact that nikkah al-Mut'ah is a kind of Marriage approved by Islam, one expects that if it is done in line with the Shari'i stipulated rules, then it will be rewarded.

EXAMINING FEW SHI'AH AHADITH ON MUT'AH

In a bid to mock the Shi'ah approval of nikkah al-Mut'ah, the Professor writes:

In the book "Man La Yahduruhul Faqih" one of the four most authentic books to Shi'ites, it was reported; Abu Abdullah Ja'afar Sadiq said; "temporary marriage is my Religion, it is also the Religion of my fore fathers. Whoever practise it has embraced and follow our Religion."

This "hadith" is nowhere to be found in the mentioned book – man la yahduruhu al-faqih – of sheikh Saduq. This is simply a pure fabrication by the Professor. On the other hand, despite the fact that the "hadith" does not exist, the expression should have been "temporary marriage is of my religion, and of the religion of my forefathers…" just like the authentic Sunni hadith "Marriage is of my Sunnah and whoever turns away from my Sunnah is not of me."[527] Therefore, there is nothing wrong or alarming even if such hadith exist.

---

[527] Sunan ibn Majah; Bab kitab an-Nikah; USC-MSA web (English) reference: vol. 3, Book 9, Hadith 1846; Arabic reference: Book 9, Hadith 1919; https://sunnah.com/urn/1319200

The Professor before fabricating the above "hadith" ascribed to Abu Abdillah (peace be upon him) has expressed the following:

If you will go through Shi'ite books, you will see wonders in the virtue of temporary marriage. They have much and unquantifiable reward by whoever practise it. They are classified as part of the practise of the "Imams" leaders; you the Shi'ites further by equating the virtue of whoever practise it to the virtue of Hussain Radiyallahu Anhu if it practiced twice, one has a virtue like Al-Hassan Radiyallahu Anhu, if it is twice, one has Ali's Radiyallahu Anhu virtue while by practicing it the fourth, one has the virtue of the Noble Prophet Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam. Fathulllahil Kashani reported this tradition in the book "Tafsiru Manhajis Sadiqina" (2/198).

It is very unfortunate that some desperate Sunni even amongst the scholars in the bid to oppose the Shi'ah will just hand pick and quote any hadith found in any book written by any of the Shi'ah scholars without [proper] investigation.

First, the book "Manhaj Sadiqina" of Sheikh Fatahullah Kashani (d. 988 H) is titled "Minhaj al-Sadiqeen Fi Elzam al-Mukhalifeen fi al-Tafsir" meaning "The way of those who are true in binding over the opponents in Tafsir." The book is not a book of hadith; rather it is a book of tafsir comparative between Sunni and Shi'ah originally written in Persian language. And its written style is a form of dialogue to refute Sunni claims especially of the author's time.

Interestingly, after citing the "hadith" in his book, Sheikh Fatahullah Kashani writes in Persian on the footnote:

.این حدیث بر فرض صحت معنی آن برما مجهول است

This hadith is unknown to us assuming that its meaning is correct.

And indeed the "hadith" is unknown and can never be found in any of the Shi'ah classical books of ahadith.

Another hadith cited in Sheikh Saduq's Man la yahduruhu al-faqih by our antagonist professor is expressed thus:

In the above book (3/356) He was asked of the reward for who practise temporary marriage whether it is certain? He replied; "if he embarks on a temporary marriage anticipating reward from Allah, what so ever he says to her is a reward" "... if he come closer to her, his sins will be forgiven. If he satisfied his emotion and proceed to have a ritual bath, any drop of water amounts to his forgiveness."

The full hadith reads:

وروى صالح بن عقبة عن أبيه عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال: قلت له: (للمتمتع ثواب؟ قال: إن كان يريد بذلك وجه الله تعالى وخلافا على من أنكرها لم يكلمها كلمة إلا كتب الله تعالى له بها حسنة. ولم يمد يده إليها إلا كتب الله له حسنة. فإذا دنا منها غفر الله تعالى له بذلك ذنبا. فإذا اغتسل غفر الله له بقدر ما مر من الماء على شعره. قلت: بعدد الشعر؟ قال: نعم بعدد الشعر).

Salih ibn Aqibah – His father – Abu Ja'far [peace be upon him]:

I said to him: Is there reward for Mut'ah [temporary] marriage? He said: If he wants that to seek the pleasure of Allah the most High and to oppose those who denied her, he will not speak a word to her except that Allah the most High writes for him a good deed. If he approach her, Allah the most High will forgive his sin; and if he takes a ritual bath, Allah will forgive him of such amount of water on his hair. I said: By the quantity of (his) hair? He (peace be upon him) said: Yes! By the quantity of (his) hair.[528]

We are obliged to ask what the antagonist's hullabaloo about this hadith is? To the Shi'ah antagonists, nikkah al-

---

[528] Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali ibn al-Husein ibn Babaway, *Kitab Man la yahduruhu al-Faqih* [Beirut: Muasassat al-'Alam lilmatbu'aah, 1st Edition, 1406 H], Vol. 3, pg. 302, Hadith 4600

Mut'ah is liken to Zina [fornication and adultery] and they are wondering how "Zina" could attract so much reward. On the contrary, it has been proven that Mut'ah is nothing but a kind of legal marriage institutionalized by Allah and His Messenger; and practicing it with the intention to seek Allah's pleasure and to prevent Zina is hasanat (good deed). If fornication is punishable, why would marriage in a legal way not be rewardable act?

The antagonists' imagination about nikkah al-Mut'ah is so wrong that the professor purged his thoughts out:

Don't be deceived with their notion/opinion that "Mut'ah" as temporary marriage is a cure/alternative for bachelors, because Khumaini in his book "Tahrirul Wasilah" he said one can practise it with a baby that still breastfeed from her mum's breast. One can hug her, put his penis between her laps, kiss her and satisfying his emotion with her!!! If she is up to seven 7 years, you can do anything and everything with her!!! Majlisi in his book "Biharul Anwar" (100/312) in the process of this marriage there is no need of witnesses!!! A marriage for ten minutes!! From the first union you just proceed to pay dowry, then seclusion and later having sexual relation. This automatically signifies a conclusion of a marital union, no witness, no announcement, nor the gathering to validate the hook. No inheritance between them, no divorce, no mourning after death? What then is the difference with the actionl of epithets/cramps?

Of course, no one argues that Mut'ah is a solution to "bachelor-hood." On the other hand, it is designed by Allah and His Messenger to solve the problem of commiting zina (illegal sexual activity) or other illegal acts (like masturbation and castration) when the sexual urge can no longer be tamed. This is beautifully expressed in the hadith of Ibn Mas'ud:

We were on an expedition with Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and we had no women with us. We said: Should we not have ourselves castrated? He (the Holy Prophet) forbade us to do so. He then granted us permission that we should contract temporary marriage for

a stipulated period giving her a garment, and Abdullah then recited this verse: Those who believe do not make unlawful the good things which Allah has made lawful for you, and do not transgress. Allah does not like trangressers" (al-Qur'an, v. 87).

These group of Sahabah could no longer bear the wrath of the sexual urge, and instead of engaging in masturbation, castration, homosexuality and bestiality, the noble Prophet instead institutionalised Mut'ah for them. Of course, some might not need it and others can engage in fasting to suppress their sexual feelings. However, Islam never denies those whose cases made them resort to nikkah al-Mut'ah.

The Professor continues:

Khumaini in his book "Tahrirul Wasilah" he said one can practise it (mut'ah) with a baby that still breastfeed from her mum's breast. One can hug her, put his penis between her laps, kiss her and satisfying his emotion with her!!! If she is up to seven 7 years, you can do anything and everything with her!

First, being a faqih (Jurist) is one of the most difficult disciplines. Passing fatawa or giving solutions to problems require ability to bring out hukm (judgement) from the book of Allah and His Prophet's Sunnah. If there is no direct hukm in these sources, the Ahlu Sunnah resort to Ijma (consensus) and Aql (intellect) both of which are not directly acceptable in Shi'i jurisprudence going by the Sunni's interpretations.

Second, there is one interesting fact about fuqaha (Jurists) and their books [Sunni-Shi'ah alike], they project and assume problems, then procure Shari'i solutions to them. This is called "imkaniyyah – possibility" and fuqaha usually use the conditional particle "if" or "even" etc. Meaning that if this or that happens, what is Islamic ruling or solution to it? Would there be punishment or not? This is what the book of Imam Khomeini, Tahrir al-wasila, is about apart from being a classical jurisprudence book.

On January 2014, a certain Christopher M. Bour, 40 years old, in the U.S pleaded guilty of paying Natisha Hillard a total of $500 [500 US dollars] to have a sex with a 4 – month old girl. And this act continues until the child was 18 months old.[529] Also, in the U.S, Tristin Mayes, 31 was arrested by the police for engaging sexual contact with a one-year-old girl.[530] There are similar cases in other parts of the world even in Muslim states. What is the Islamic legal ruling in cases like this?

Third, there is a case of child betrothal and child marriage around the globe especially in Muslim societies. The editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica writes:

Betrothal, promise that a marriage will take place. In societies in which premarital relations are condoned or in which consensual union is common, betrothal may be unimportant. In other societies, however, betrothal is a formal part of the marriage process…[531]

We are not interested in fiqih (jurisprudence) or ethical judgement on this issue. However, what is the Islamic Shari'a ruling on the "husband" and the betrothed infant/child/girl in societies where it is being practiced?

Imam Ruhullah Khomeini (d. 1989) on Mas'ala [Problem] No. 12 under the section of marriage rules:

Intercourse with a woman is not allowed unless she attains the age of nine years[532] , regardless whether the marriage is permanent or temporary. There is, however, no objection in other enjoyments like touching lasciviously, hugging and rubbing the thighs, even with a suckling infant. If a

---

[529] Sun-Times Media Wire © Chicago Sun-Times 2014. https://chicago.cbslocal.com/2014/05/16/man-gets-life-sentence-for-having-sex-with-infant/

[530] http://fox17.com/news/nation-world/police-new-york-man-recorded-himself-having-sex-with-infant

[531] https://www.britannical.com/topic/betrothal

[532] Age "nine" is the Shari'i age for a woman to have legal sex (after consummation of marriage); however, it never translates to obligation to get a 9-year-old girl married. Such child might have matured but not really for marriage.

person has had intercourse with a girl before she has attained the age of nine years, but it has not resulted in Ifda,' he shall not be subjected to any punishment, except that he shall be considered to have committed a sin. If his intercourse has resulted in Ifda', so that the urinal and menstrual or the menstrual and fecal passages have become one, she shall be rendered perpetually prohibited to him, though, according to the more cautious opinion, it shall be so in the latter case. In any case, according to the stronger opinion, she shall not cease to be his wife. ...[533]

This is the ruling of Imam Khomeini (quddisa siruh). Now compare this with the wicked lies and fabrication of the Professor:

Khumaini in his book "Tahrirul Wasilah" he said one can practise it (mut'ah) with a baby that still breastfeed from her mum's breast. One can hug her, put his penis between her laps, kiss her and satisfying his emotion with her!!! If she is up to seven 7 years, you can do anything and everything with her!

Interestingly, the Ulama of Ahlu Sunnah had similar ruling and some did not even set age limit for the sexual intercourse.

Imam an-Nawawi on "باب تزويج الأب البكر الصغيرة – the chapter of the father marrying (out) of his prepubescent virgin girl child" writes:

وأما وقت زفاف الصغيرة المزوجة والدخول بها فإن اتفق الزوج والولي على شيء لا ضرر فيه على الصغيرة عمل به ، وإن اختلفا فقال أحمد وأبو عبيد : تجبر على ذلك بنت تسع سنين دون غيرها . وقال مالك

---

[533] Ruhullah al-Musawi al-Khomeini, *Tahrir al-Wasila* (Tehran: Institute for compilation & Publication of Imam Khomeini's works, 1386 H), Section 38 Kitab al-Nikkah, Mas'ala No. 12; vol. 3, pg. 229

والشافعي وأبو حنيفة : حد ذلك أن تطيق الجماع ، ويختلف ذلك باختلافهن ، ولا يضبط بسن . وهذا هو الصحيح

As for the time of the wedding of a prepubescent married girl child and entry upon her [sexual intercourse], if the husband and the guardian [her father] agreed, there is no harm in something on the child, he can act on it. And if one disagrees, then Ahmed and Abu Ubaid said: A girl of nine years is [to be] forced to do that; and Malik, Al-Shafi'i and Abu Hanifa said: The limit for that is to tolerate sexual intercourse, and this differs according to their differences, and it is not set by age. This is correct.[534]

The Professor tried his final staunt. He writes:

Imagine a society with this attitude!! How can one have full confidence in the morality of his children, brother's even wife/wives? To be frank as a Shi'ite, will you be comfortable your daughter to practise it? Or to be practiced with your mother, or your sister?

Again, in the ignorant interpretation of the Professor, nikkah al-Mut'ah is adultery and fornication, and any woman who practised it is a prostitute. However, following are established facts about Mut'ah:

- It is a legalised practise by the Shari'ah
- Technically, there is no difference between nikkah al-mut'ah and permanent marriage.
- It is a special form of marriage only for those in need of it. It is not meant for just anybody and everybody. It is rather for, for example, a widow or divorcee or an independent woman with no husband; or a businessman who is far away from his wife(s) – just like the sahabah who were on expendition with the Prophet and could not control their sexual urge any longer.

---

[534] Sahih Muslim Bi-Sharh an-Nawawi (Beirut: Muasassat Qurtubah, 1414 H), vol. 9, pg. 295

- There are Shari'i rules and guideliness for its practise; for example, a virgin girl or dependent lady can never practise Mut'ah except with the approval of her father or guardian; 'Iddah (waiting period, between two menstrual circle and 4 months) for a woman whose mut'ah term elapsed; it becomes haram for a

married woman (just like a married woman in permanent marriage cannot marry two husband at a time) etc.

All these are well established fiqh regulations in both Sunni and Shi'i ahadith. Lastly, if there is any sect women should run away from, it is the Salafiyyah sect. While the Salafiyyah Shuyukh (past and present) felt the need for real solution to fact three mentioned above, they have no choice than to fabricate a type of marriage called "al-Zawaj bi niyyah al-Talaq (marriage with the intention of divorce)." In this type of Ahlu Sunnah-Salafiyyah marriage, a traveller for example can marry a woman of his choice with a hidden intention to divorce her whenever he is ready to leave the vicinity (state or country he travelled to). For example, the popular Ahlu Sunnah Shaykh Sayyid Sabiq declares:

"The [Ahlu Sunnah] jurists unanimously agree that whoever marries a woman without (openly disclosing) any time limit as a condition, and his intention is to divorce her after a period of time, or after the fulfilment of his need in the town where he resides, then the marriage is valid. But, al-Awzā'ī disagreed and called it a mut'ah marriage."[535]

This Ahlu Sunnah fabrication is obviously not nikkah al-Mut'ah as erroneously and fanatically claimed by al-Awzai. We appeal to justice: which one is more dignified – the one a woman will agree on stipulated period or the one she will not be kept in the loop and will have to face the trauma of unjust divorce?

---

[535] Sayyid Sābiq, *Fiqh al-Sunnah* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī; 3rd edition, 1397 H), vol. 2, p. 45

The Professor ends his 71st "question" with this false hadith:

In the same book (3/366) they reported a claim Prophetic narration as follows; "whoever practise a temporary marriage one is free from Allah's wrath, if is twice he will be raised on the day of resurrection among the righteous, if is thrice we will be together racing to enter paradise."

Finally, he asked his 72nd question when he states:

Our 72nd question is the meaning of the hadith reported in "Biharul Anwar" (100/308) when Abu Abdullah was asked on temporary marriage, he said: "Don't filth yourself with it."

It is imperative to quote the hadith properly. Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn 'Isa al-Ash'ari documents:

قال محمد بن أبي عمر عن عبد الله بن سنان قال سألت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام عن المتعة؟ فقال: لا تدنس نفسك بها.

Muhammad b. Abi Umayr – Abd Allah b. Sinan:

I asked Abu Abd Allah, peace be upon him, about mut'ah. So, he said, "Do not desecrate yourself with it."[536]

The foremost problem of the hadith is that it is found in an unreliable book. Yes! It is true that Ahmad ibn Muhammad Ibn 'Isa wrote a Nawadir but it has not reached us via reliable means; hence, what we have today in al-Nawadir is not authenticated. Allamah al-Muhsini writes about the book:

والحق عدم إعتبار أحاديثها المنقولة في البحار و الوسائل والمستدرك وما يوجد في النسخة المطبوعة منها

---

[536] Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Ash'arī al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-Nawādir* (Qum: Muasassat al-Imām al-Mahdī; 1st edition, 1408 H), p. 87, # 198

The truth is the unreliability of its ahadith which are quoted in al-Bihar (al-Anwar), al-Wasail and al-Mustadrak, and whatever is found in the published manuscript from it.[537]

Mirza al-Nuri (d. 1320 H) also states about the unreliability of the book al-Nawadir in his book.[538] It is from this unreliable book that Allamah al-Majlisi quoted and documents the same hadith. Therefore, the hadith is weak (da'if) by default. And the fact that it is even in opposition to the verse of Mut'ah [in the noble Qur'an) and authentic ahadith on Mut'ah clearly showed the hadith is a fabrication.

STILL ON MUT'AH

Question 73:

To the best of our knowledge, all the virtues and rewards that one can gain by practicing "mut'ah" (temporary marriage) have slipped past all your Imams (leaders), just as Fatima, Radiyallahu Anha, did not have such an opportunity. Therefore, we cannot ask you how many times they engaged in temporary marriage or with whom these marriages occurred. How many children did they have from these unions? However, if you have any remarks on these matters, we would be glad to share them with you.

THE REPLY

As stated earlier, nikkah al-Mut'ah is only for those in need of it. Sheikh Kulayni (d. 329 H) documents:

---

[537] Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, *Buḥūth fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl* (Markaz al-Muṣṭafā al-'Ālamī li Tarjamah wa al-Nashr), p. 422, # 3
On page 421 – 422, No. 3, details of the academic exposition of the book and its unreliabile transmission to al-Majlisi and others is stated.

[538] Mirzā Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, *Khātimah Mustadrak al-Wasāil* (Qum: Muasassat Āl al-Bayt 'Alaihim al-Salām li Iḥyā al-Turāth; 1st edition, 1415 H), vol. 1, pp. 30-31

'Alī b. Ibrāhīm – his father – Ibn Abī 'Umayr – 'Alī b. Yaqṭīn:

I asked Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā, peace be upon him, concerning mut'ah, and he said, "What do you have to do with that, for Allāh has already made you needless of it?" I said, "I only want to learn about it." Then he said, "It is in the Book of 'Alī, peace be upon him." So, I said, "Do we increase it and is it multiplied?" He said, "Is there anything that pleases him except that?"[539]

The Aimmah of the Ahl al-Bayt (peace be upon them) together with their father Rasulullah (peace be upon him and his progeny) were not like common and regular people. For example, Sadaqat can be taken by the regulars but it is haram for the Prophet and his progeny. Prophet, Imam Ali and Imam al-Hasan married lots of women [although under certain circumstance] but ours is limited to four freed women. Besides, whether they practice nikkah al-Mut'ah or not, or with whom they practice it with is none of our business. They are the legislators of the Deen, our responsibility is to obey their rulings.

Lastly, it is forbideen for a married woman to perform nikkah al-Mut'ah while her husband is still alive and she is not divorced. This is the same ruling in the permanent marriage. Therefore, asking in rather a mocking way that "... the same way, as Fatima Radiyallahu Anhu hasn't have such an opportunity" clearly expose the knowledge of the Professor about nikkah al-Mut'ah to be nothing to write home about.

---

[539] Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, *al-Furū' min al-Kāfi* (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah) [annotator: 'Alī Akbar al-Ghiffārī], vol. 5, p. 452, # 1

AS-SUJJUD 'ALA AT-TUR'BAH [PROSTRATION ON EARTH]

CHAPTER FOURTY FOUR

TURBAH AL-HUSEINIYAH

Question 74:

It's a practice of the Shi'ites to prostrate on "turba," i.e., the sand of Karbala. They believe that nothing on this earth is as pure as that sand (turba). They claim it is even purer

than the sand on which the Noble Prophet was buried and even purer than the throne of Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala (Al-Arsh)!

Our question is whether the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, ever used it to prostrate. If your answer is in the affirmative, we know it is a fabrication. But if the answer is in the negative, we ask: are you better than the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam? In your narrations, it is reported that Angel Gabriel (Jibril) brought the sand to the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, and told him that his grandson Hussain would be assassinated on it. It is further reported that the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, cried when it was presented to him. You claim it to be the purest; why didn't the Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, prostrate on it? It was presented to him, wasn't it?

THE REPLY

It is interesting how the Professor begins his submission but has to spice it with sheer lies and fabrications that we have never heard of though he is very right that:

It's a practise of the Shi'ites to prostrate on "turba"

"Tur'ba" simply means dust or soil of the earth. However, as expected, our antagonistic Professor added his own interpretation and tales. He continues:

i.e., the sand of Karbala. They believe that nothing on this earth is as pure as that sand (turba). They claim it is even purer than the sand on which the Noble Prophet was buried and even purer than the throne of Allah, Subhanahu wa Ta'ala (Al-Arsh)!

Indeed, tur'ba al-Huseiniyah is believed to be a blessed soil as already stated in series of Ahlu Sunnah ahadith in previous chapter.[540]

---

[540] See chapter *fourty four* (44) under the title "Crying for the martyrs of Kar'bala" for details

Allamah Nasir al-Din al-Albani further documents:

أتاني جبريل فأخبرني أن أمتي ستقتل ابني هذا يعني الحسين، و أتاني بتربة من تربته حمراء

(صحيح)

He (the Prophet) says: Jubril came to me and informed me that my Nation (Ummah) will kill my son, meaning Hussein, and brought me some red soil from amongst (Hussein's) soil (تربته)[541]

Comments: Sahih (authentic).

The very fact that the angels carried and brought the soil to the Prophet, and he (peace be upon him and his progeny) smelled and kissed it; and even kept it in the custody of his beloved wife Umm Salamah simply testifies to the blessedness of this soil. After all, the angels can just give the news of the martyrdom of al-Husein on the soil of Karbala without bringing the soil itself. No (other person's) soil enjoyed this significance and attention from the Prophet. This is the primary reason that made the Shi'ah hold this soil in high esteem.

However, there is absolutely no authentic Shi'ah hadith which ever states that the Huseini soil is more sacred or more blessed than the soil on which the noble Prophet was buried. Besides, it is not even the soil that is sacred on its own rather it is the blessed body that is laid on it which gives the soil its significance. Therefore, our firm and proven belief is that the noble Prophet is the most perfected being and the purest of Allah's creatures. This makes his

---

[541] Sahih Jami al-Sagheer (Published by the Islamic Library) [annotator: Zuhair Shaweesh], volume 1, pg.73, Hadith 61; Silsilah Sahih al-Hadith (series of authentic hadiths), volume 2, Hadith #821 (hadith of Umm Fadhl); volume 3, from hadith 1001 - 1500.
Albani says: There are many proofs that testify to its authenticity; some of which Ahmad has narrated.

blessed soil more sacred and more blessed than any other soil on earth.

Having said this, we need to emphatically add that it is never a necessity or even a requirement of sajdah validity (in salat) that one should perform sujud on tur'bah al-Huseiniyyah. It is only a recommendation knowing its sacredness. Had there been an access to the blessed soil of Sayyid al-Bashar (the noble Prophet), it would have been given more priority. This is at-Tabarruk (seeking Allah's blessing via a mean) which all Muslims (except the wahabiyyah) unanimously embraced.

Interestingly, neither the Prophet's soil nor Huseini soil can be accessed due to the fact that mausoleum has been built on each, and the surroundings plastered with concrete. Had the Shi'ah depend solely on Huseini soil in performing sajdah, it would have been difficult to do so apart from the fact that the place itself would have become a giant pit over the years due to collection of soil. All these exposed the lies and fabrications of the Professor.

The question that:

You claim it to be the purest, why didn't the Prophet Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam prostrate on it? It was present to him, isn't it?

For a fact, Shi'ah have not made any claim that the noble Prophet prostrated or did not prostrate on the soil ever since it was given to him by various angels. Whatever the imagination of our antagonistic Professor is, the onus is on him to prove or disprove himself.

PROSTRATION ON EARTH DURING SALAT

It is a proven fact that the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) never placed his blessed forehead (during sujud) on anything other than the earth (soil, mud, dust) or what comes out of the earth (like palm fibre mat – khumrah) in his salat. He even commanded his sahabah to do the same. Placing the forehead on cloth, rug mat, carpet, and synthetic tiles is innovation (Bid'ah) that became widespread in Deen. One of the foremost students

of shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah, Imam Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzi writes:

وكذلك ترى أحدهم لا يصلِّي إلا على سجادة، ولم يصل رسول الله عليه السلام على سجادة قط، ولا كانت السجادة تفرش بين يديه، بل كان يصلِّي على الأرض وربما سجد في الطين، وكان يصلِّي على الحصير فيصلي على ما اتفق بسطه، فإن لم يكن ثمة شيء صلَّى على الأرض

...you will see one of them (people of Bid'ah - innovation) never praying except on a rug, and the messenger of Allah never ever prayed on a rug and neither had a rug been put for him. Instead, he would pray on earth (Ar'd), and he sometimes prostrated on clay (tin). He used to pray on a palm fibre mat and pray according to what was agreed upon. If there was nothing, he would pray on the earth.

He continues elsewhere:

وقد صلى النبي على حصير قد اسود من طول ما لبس فنضح له ... بالماء وصلى عليه ولم يفرش له فوقه سجادة ولا منديل وكان يسجد على التراب تارة وعلى الحصى تارة وفي الطين تارة حتى يرى أثره على جبهته وأنفه

...and he (the Prophet) used to pray on a (fibre) mat and this mat had gotten black due to usage (for praying), then this mat would be washed with water and he (would) pray on it. He never put a rug or a cloth above this (mat). And sometimes he would prostrate on dust (Turab) and sometimes on the stones, and other times he was prostrating on mud till you could see its effect (marks) on his forehead and nose.[542]

---

[542] Shams al-Din Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyah, *Ighathatul lahfan fi masayed ash-Shaytan* (Beirut: Dar al-'Ilm al-Fawaa'id) [annotator: Muhammad Azeez Shams and Mustafa Ibn Sa'eed], page 218 & 268.

Note that this explicit explanation of Ibn al-Jawzi is established from several ahadith of the Prophet. For example:

Imam al-Tirmidhi documents:

عَنْ أَبِي حُمَيْدٍ السَّاعِدِيِّ، أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم كَانَ إِذَا سَجَدَ أَمْكَنَ أَنْفَهُ وَجَبْهَتَهُ مِنَ الأَرْضِ وَنَحَّى يَدَيْهِ عَنْ جَنْبَيْهِ وَوَضَعَ كَفَّيْهِ حَذْوَ مَنْكِبَيْهِ

When the Prophet would prostrate, he placed his nose and his forehead on the earth, and he held his forearms away from his sides, and he placed his hands parallel to his shoulders.[543]

Sheikh al-Albani comments: Sahih (authentic)

And placing the forehead on the earth is what the noble Prophet used to command. Imam Hakim documents this hadith:

حدثنا : أبو بكر محمد بن أحمد بن بالويه ، ثنا : محمد بن أحمد بن النضر الأزدي ، ثنا : معاوية بن عمرو ، ثنا : زائدة ، عن أبي حمزة ، عن أبي صالح ، قال : كنت عند أم سلمة فدخل عليها ذو قرابة لها شاب ذو جمة ، فقام يصلي فنفخ ، فقال : يا بني لا تنفخ فانه سمعت رسول الله (ص) ، يقول لعبد لنا أسود : أي رباح ترب وجهك

Narrated Abi Saalih, he said:

I was with Umm Salamah, and a relative of hers entered her. Then, he performed salat and was blowing dust (away from the place of sujud). She said: O son, do not blow away (the dust), for I heard the Messenger of God (peace be upon

---

[543] Muhammad ibn Eesa al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al*-Tirmidhi (Riyadh: Maktab al-Ma'arifah, 1st Edition) [annotator: Muhammad Nasir din al-Albani], pg. 77, Hadith no. 270

him) saying to a black servant of us: "O Rabah, rub your face on dust."[544]

Imam Hakim comments: This hadith is Sahih (authentic)... هذا حديث صحيح الاسناد ، ولم يخرجاه

Dhahabi also comments: Sahih

Imam Mahmud al-Ayni while commenting on praying on the fibre mat relates another hadith:

قَوْله: عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاة وَالسَّلَام، لِمعَاذ رَضِي اتعالى عَنهُ: (عفر وَجهك فِي التُّرَاب)

His (peace be upon him) saying to Muadh (may Allah be pleased with him): Cover your face with dust (i.e prostrate on the dust).[545]

Sometimes, the noble Prophet used to place infront of him, and prostrate on al-Khumra[546] , a small piece of fibre mat of the size of the forehead. He never prostrated on clothing material, rug or carpet. Rather, he only performed sajdah on the earth (soil, dust, stone) or what comes out of the soil (wood, fibre mat etc that is not eatable).

SAJDAH ON CLOTH – A WRONG ACT

There might be objection that a "sahabi" prostrated on the cloth and therefore justifying the legality of sujud on rug. Imam Muslim documents:

---

[544] Abu Abdillah Al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, *Mustadrak a'la as-Sahihayn* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah) [annotator: Mustafa Abdul-Qadri 'Ata], vol. 1, pg. 404, hadith 1001

[545] Badr al-Din Abi Muhammad Mahmud ibn Ahmad al-Ayni, *Umdat al-Qaariy Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* (Beirut: Dar al-kutub al'Ilmiyyah, 1st Edition, 1421 H), vol. 4, pg. 162

[546] Sunan ibn Majah; Bab kitab Iqama salat wa sunnah fiha; USC-MSA web (English) reference : vol. 1, Book 5, Hadith 1028; Arabic reference : Book 5, Hadith 1081; https://sunnah.com/urn/1283760

حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ يَحْيَى، حَدَّثَنَا بِشْرُ بْنُ الْمُفَضَّلِ، عَنْ غَالِبٍ الْقَطَّانِ، عَنْ بَكْرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ، قَالَ كُنَّا نُصَلِّي مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فِي شِدَّةِ الْحَرِّ فَإِذَا لَمْ يَسْتَطِعْ أَحَدُنَا أَنْ يُمَكِّنَ جَبْهَتَهُ مِنَ الأَرْضِ بَسَطَ ثَوْبَهُ فَسَجَدَ عَلَيْهِ .

Anas b. Malik reported:

We used to say (the noonprayer) with the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) in the intense heat, but when someone amongst us found it hard to place his forehead on the ground, he spread his cloth and prostrated on it.[547]

For a fact this act was done without Prophet's notification or approval; therefore, cannot be said to be correct. On the contrary, Imam Abu Dawud documents a prominent sahabi who understood the Sunnah better:

حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ حَنْبَلٍ، وَمُسَدَّدٌ، قَالاَ حَدَّثَنَا عَبَّادُ بْنُ عَبَّادٍ، حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَمْرٍو، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ الْحَارِثِ الأَنْصَارِيِّ، عَنْ جَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ كُنْتُ أُصَلِّي الظُّهْرَ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَآخُذُ قَبْضَةً مِنَ الْحَصَى لِتَبْرُدَ فِي كَفِّي أَضَعُهَا لِجَبْهَتِي أَسْجُدُ عَلَيْهَا لِشِدَّةِ الْحَرِّ

Narrated Jabir ibn Abdullah:

I would offer my noon prayer with the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and took a handful of gravels so that they might become cold in my hand and I placed them (before me) so that I may put my forehead on them at the time when I would prostrate. I did this due to the intensity of heat.[548]

---

[547] Sahih Muslim 620; In-book reference : Book 5, Hadith 243; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 4, Hadith 1296 https://sunnah.com/muslim/5/243

[548] Sunan Abi Dawud 399; In-book reference : Book 2, Hadith 9; English translation : Book 2, Hadith 399 https://sunnah.com/abudawud/2/9

Indeed, there should be no excuse to prostrate on other than earth (soil, dust, stones) or what comes out of it. Only the Shi'ah keep this Sunnah of the Prophet and they are being stigmatised for that.

Lastly, it is also documented that a prominent righteous salaf, Caliph Umar ibn Abd al-Azeez used to combine the Sunnah of using al-Khumrah and sand. Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani documents:

قوله : (وكان يصلي على الخمرة) وقد تقدم ضبطها في آخر كتاب الحيض.

قال ابن بطال : لا خلاف بين فقهاء الأمصار في جواز الصلاة عليها إلا ما روي عن عمر بن عبد العزيز أنه كان يؤتى بتراب فيوضع على الخمرة فيسجد عليه ، ولعله كان يفعله على جهة المبالغة في التواضع والخشوع فلا يكون فيه مخالفة للجماعة ، وقد روى ابن أبي شيبة عن عروة بن الزبير أنه كان يكره الصلاة على شيء دون الأرض ، وكذا روي عن غير عروة ، ويحتمل أن يحمل على كراهة التنزيه ، والله أعلم

His saying: (He used to prostrate on al-Khumrah), it is documented in the last book of al-Haydh (Menstruation).

Ibn Battal said: There is no disagreement among the jurists about the permissibility of praying on it [al-Khumrah] except for what was narrated on the authority of Umar bin Abdul Aziz that he used to bring sands and put it on the khumrah and prostrate on it. Perhaps he did that on the basis of expressing humility and reverence and that does not contradict what the consensus agreed upon. Shaybah on the authority of Urwah ibn al-Zubayr who said that he used to hate praying on something other than the earth, and similar thing was narrated on the authority of other

than Urwah, and it is possible that it is based on the dislike of disliking, and God knows best.[549]

Why the Ahlu Sunnah especially the salafiyyah deviated from this Sunnah of the Prophet and choose to embrace innovation till date is better known to them. Yet, they will stop at nothing condemning the Shi'ah.

THE SEVEN BONES

Question 75:

In the book of "Wasa'ilus Shi'ah," (3/598) it is narrated; "It is imperative when prostrating to use eight joints; forehead, nose, two palms, knees, toes.

Why don't you use eight of the "turba"? Have you neglected this tradition? Or is it a selfish and baseless interests and arguments?

THE REPLY

Obviously, this question comes out of either ignorance or effort to attack the Shi'ah by all means. Both Ahlu Sunnah and Shi'ah document the hadith which states:

عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ، عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَ أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَسْجُدَ عَلَى سَبْعَةِ أَعْظُمٍ عَلَى الْجَبْهَةِ وَأَشَارَ بِيَدِهِ عَلَى الأَنْفِ وَالْيَدَيْنِ وَالرُّكْبَتَيْنِ وَأَطْرَافِ الْقَدَمَيْنِ

It was narrated from Ibn 'Abbas that:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: I have been commanded to prostrate on seven bones: on the forehead

---

[549] Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *Fath al-Baar bi Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* (Beirut: Dar al-Risalah al-'Ilmiyyah, 1st Edition, 1434 H)[annotator: Shua'ib al-Ar'naut], vol. 2, 262.

– and he pointed with his hand - on the nose, the hands, the knees and the ends of the feet.[550]

Comment: Sahih (authentic)

The bones are counted as seven and not eight since the "forehead and nose" is counted as one. However, the fact that all other six bones could be covered with cloth [since we naturally wear cloth during salat], therefore, it is not obligatory for them to touch the earth directly. The "face – forehead and nose" is the must to touch the earth in sujud.

It is obvious that Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) wore cloth and probably socks (during the winters), and usually stands on the (firbre) mat; the fact that some of his blessed bones did not touch the earth directly unlike his forehead and nose signifies non-compulsion of those parts to touch tur'ba (soil).

WEARING BLACK CLOTHS

Question 76:

Why do the males and females among you wear black clothes? This question shouldn't surprise anyone because Abu Ja'afar Al-Qummi, in his book "Man La Yahduruhul Faqih" (1/232) and "Wasa'il al-Shi'ah" (2/136), reported that Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, gave a will to his followers: "Don't ever wear black clothes because it is the clothing of Pharaoh (Fira'un)."

In the book "Tafsirus Safi," the author, in explaining the meaning of the verse Q60:12, states: "...and that they will not disobey you in 'Ma'aruf' (Islamic monotheism and all that which Islam ordains)." He relates that the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, accepted the pledge of women "not to wear black clothes, not to tear and wound themselves during calamity (death), and not to cry out and say, 'Oh Allah!'" This, I think, should be related to the Shi'ite scholars to stop wearing those black turbans

---

[550] Sunan an-Nasa'i 1097; In-book reference: Book 12, Hadith 69; English translation: vol. 2, Book 12, Hadith 109 https://sunnah.com/nasai/12/69

and instead wear white! However, the Noble Prophet, Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam, loved white clothes more than any other color. Why do your scholars wear black?

Remember, the above is from your book. Even in the introduction, it states that the book is called "Safi" because it was well researched, scrutinized, and contains no narrations from Sunni sources. The author made this statement against black clothes!

Please tell me, who in the world wears black clothes other than the sisters and wives of the Shi'ites? Why do they wear black clothes?

THE REPLY

Traditionally, Muslim women over the ages wear black abaya when they are outside their homes, being a non-attractive clothing material. Requirements of Hijab of a Muslim woman is to avoid attractive cloth, tight-fitted dress and transparent materials. However, in Shi'i fiqh (jurisprudence), it is discouraged (not haram) to wear black cloth for salat unless there are vital reasons for it.

Furthermore, it is generally acceptable by all that black cloth signifies "grieving, sorrow and mourning." Hence, one of the apparent traditional ways (if not the quickest way) of expressing the mourning of the martyrs of Kar'bala is wearing black cloths during the month of Muharram and Safar. In a famous Shi'i tradition of Rahyyan ibn Shabib, Sheikh Saduq (d. 381 H) narrates:

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ مَاجِيلَوَيْهِ رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ الرَّيَّانِ بْنِ شَبِيبٍ قَالَ: دَخَلْتُ عَلَى الرِّضَا (ع) فِي أَوَّلِ يَوْمٍ مِنَ الْمُحَرَّمِ فَقَالَ لِي يَا ابْنَ شَبِيبٍ أَ صَائِمٌ أَنْتَ فَقُلْتُ لَا فَقَالَ إِنَّ هَذَا الْيَوْمَ هُوَ الْيَوْمُ الَّذِي دَعَا فِيهِ زَكَرِيَّا (ع) رَبَّهُ عَزَّ وَ جَلَّ فَقَالَ «رَبِّ هَبْ لِي مِنْ لَدُنْكَ ذُرِّيَّةً طَيِّبَةً إِنَّكَ سَمِيعُ الدُّعاءِ» فَاسْتَجَابَ اللَّهُ لَهُ وَ أَمَرَ الْمَلَائِكَةَ فَنَادَتْ زَكَرِيَّا «وَ هُوَ قائِمٌ يُصَلِّي فِي الْمِحْرابِ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يُبَشِّرُكَ

بِيَحْيِي» فَمَنْ صَامَ هَذَا الْيَوْمَ ثُمَّ دَعَا اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَ جَلَّ اسْتَجَابَ اللَّهُ لَهُ كَمَااسْتَجَابَ لِزَكَرِيَّا (ع) ثُمَّ قَالَ يَا ابْنَ شَبِيبٍ إِنَّ الْمُحَرَّمَ هُوَ الشَّهْرُ الَّذِي كَانَ أَهْلُ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ فِيمَا مَضَى يُحَرِّمُونَ فِيهِ الظُّلْمَ وَ الْقِتَالَ لِحُرْمَتِهِ فَمَا عَرَفَتْ هَذِهِ الْأُمَّةُ حُرْمَةَ شَهْرِهَا وَ لَا حُرْمَةَ نَبِيِّهَا (ص) لَقَدْ قَتَلُوا فِي هَذَا الشَّهْرِ ذُرِّيَّتَهُ وَ سَبَوْا نِسَاءَهُ وَ انْتَهَبُوا ثَقَلَهُ فَلَا غَفَرَ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ ذَلِكَ أَبَداً يَا ابْنَ شَبِيبٍ إِنْ كُنْتَ بَاكِياً لِشَيْءٍ فَابْكِ لِلْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ أَبِي طَالِبٍ (ع) فَإِنَّهُ ذُبِحَ كَمَا يُذْبَحُ الْكَبْشُ وَ قُتِلَ مَعَهُ مِنْ أَهْلِ بَيْتِهِ ...

Muhammad ibn Ali Maajilaway - Ali ibn Ibrahim - his father - Rahyyan ibn Shabib:

I entered unto ar-Rida (as) on the first day of Muharram and he told me: O son of Shabib, are you fasting? I said No! He said: Today was the day Zakariyah prayed to his Lord the Majesty [My Lord! Bestow upon me of Thy bounty goodly offspring. Lo! Thou art the Hearer of Prayer] and Allah granted his prayer and ordered an angel (unto him) who called Zakariyah [as he stood praying in the sanctuary: Allah giveth thee glad tidings of (a son whose name is) Yahya, (who cometh) to confirm a word from Allah lordly, chaste, a prophet of the righteous]. Whoever fasts on this day and then pray unto Allah, the Majesty; his prayer will be granted as Allah granted the prayer of Zakariyah.

Then he (peace be upon him) said: O son of Shabib, "Muharram is such a sacred month that even the Arab of the age of ignorance (jahiliyyah) too respected its sanctity and forbade oppression and bloodshed in it. But these people (the ummayads) did not honour the sanctity of this month nor of their Prophet. In this month, they killed the son of their prophet and imprisoned the women-folk after looting and plundering their belongings, verily Allah will never ever forgive this crime of theirs. O son of Shabib! If you are to shed tears for anything, shed tears for Husein ibn Ali who was slaughtered just like a ram is slaughtered,

and those who were with him of the Ahl al-Bayt were also killed..."[551]

We have earlier brought recurrent hadith that even the noble Prophet used to cry profusely for the gruesome killing of his grandson, al-Husein. Therefore, wearing black cloth to express our sorrowful feelings is the least.

However, the Professor seems to have a piece of advice for "the Shi'ah scholars" pertaining to wearing of "black turbans." He writes:

In the book "Tafsirus Safi" the author in giving the meaning of the verse Q60:12 "...and that they will not disobey you in "Ma'aruf" (Islamic monotheism and all that which Islam ordains)." He relates that the Noble Prophet Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam accept the pledge of women "not to wear black clothes, not to also tear and wound themselves during calamity (death), and not to cry and say Oh Allah" this I think should be related to the Shi'ite scholars to stop putting those black "turban" and wear white!! However, the Noble Prophet Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam love white clothes more than any color, why do your scholars wear black?

Of course, majority of Shi'a scholars wear white turban (Islamic headgear for scholars) and traditionally, only the Sayyids (the descendants of the Prophet) wear black turbans being tradition of their blessed grandfather (peace be upon him and his progeny). However, talking about the exceptionality of black turban, Sheikh al-Kulayni (d. 329 H) documents:

A number of our companions – Ahmad ibn Abi Abd Allah – some of his companions [– (Abu Abdillah)]:[552]

---

[551] Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi, *al-Amali*(Beirut: Muasassat A'lami), vol. 1, pg. 129

[552] The sanad reaches Abu Abdillah (peace be upon him) in the version of Sheikh Saduq in 'Ilal al-Shara'i, vol. 2, chapter 56, hadith No. 3.

قال: كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله يكره السواد إلا في ثلاث العمام والخف والكساء

Abu Abdullah has said: 'Rasool-Allah (peace be upon him and his progeny) used to dislike the black (clothes) except in three – the turban, and the socks, and the cloak'.[553]

Allamah Majlisi comments: Mar'fu[554]

Furthermore, Imam Ibn Majah also documents:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو بَكْرِ بْنُ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ، حَدَّثَنَا وَكِيعٌ، حَدَّثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ سَلَمَةَ، عَنْ أَبِي الزُّبَيْرِ، عَنْ جَابِرٍ، أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم دَخَلَ مَكَّةَ وَعَلَيْهِ عِمَامَةٌ سَوْدَاء

It was narrated from Jabir that the Prophet (peace be upon him) entered Makkah wearing a black turban.[555]

Grade: Sahih (authentic)

AHADITH WHICH DISCOURAGE BLACK CLOTHS

There are few ahadith which discourage wearing of black cloths and on the contrary, few other ahadith seem to indicate it is not haram to wear it (especially for few reasons stated earlier). Therefore, the hukm (judgment) was that it is makrooh and not haram. However, the Professor writes:

Why do males & females of you wear black clothes? This question shouldn't surprise any one because, Abu Ja'afar Al-qummi in his book "Man La Yahduruhul faqih"

---

[553] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, Furu' al-Kafi (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 6, pg. 281, hadith no. 1

[554] Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 22, pg. 327

[555] Sunan Ibn Majah, English reference : Vol. 4, Book 24, Hadith 2822; Arabic reference : Book 24, Hadith 2929; https://sunnah.com/urn/1276710

(1/232), & "Wasa'lus-Shi'ah" (2/136) Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu has gave a will to his followers; "don't you ever wear black clothes because is the clothes of Pharaoh (Fira'un)"

Sheikh Saduq documents:

وبهذا الاسناد عن محمد بن احمد عن محمد بن عيسى اليقطيني عن القاسم ابن يحيى عن جده الحسن بن راشد عن ابى بصير عبد الله (ع) قال: حدثني أبي، عن جدي، عن ابيه عن أمير المؤمنين (ع) قال: فيما علم اصحابه لا تلبسوا السواد فانه لباس فرعون

And by this chain, from Muhammad Bin Ahmad, from Muhammad Bin Isa Al Yaqteeny, from Al Qasim Ibn Yahya, from his grandfather Al Hassan Bin Rashid, from Abu Baseer:

Abu Abdullah has said: 'My father narrated to me, from my grandfather, from his father, from Amir Al-Momineen having said in what he taught his companions: 'Do not wear the black, for it is a clothing of Pharaoh.[556]

The hadith is definitely sahih (authentic) as all the narrators in the chain are trustworthy. Commenting on this hadith, Allamah Muhammad Taqi b. Maqsud writes:

و قال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام» رواه الصدوق عن أبي بصير، عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام عنه عليه السلام «فيما (إلى قوله) فرعون» و كناية عن أن من يلبسها من فراعنة هذه الأمة و هكذا كانوا بل كانوا أشقى من فرعون

"And the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, said." Narrated by Al-Saduq, on the authority of Abu

---

[556] Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi, *Kitab Man la yahduruhul Faqih* (Beirut: Manshuraah Muasassatul-'Alam lil-Matbu'aah, 1st Edition, 1406 H), vol. 1, pg. 177, hadith No. 767; *'Ilal al-Shara'i*, vol. 2, chapter 56, hadith No. 3.

Basir, on the authority of Abu Abdullah, peace be upon him, on him, "as to what he said by Pharaoh" and it is a metaphor for the fact that whoever wears it is one of the Pharaohs of this nation, and so they were, but they were wicked than Pharaoh.[557]

It seems after all that Imam Ali instructed his sahabah then not to emulate certain people. Who were these people that they were likened to the Pharaoh? Who were "they?" Another hadith worth to be mentioned is also documented by Sheikh Saduq:

أبي رحمه الله قال: حدثنا محمد بن يحيى العطار عن محمد بن احمد عن سهل بن زياد عن محمد بن سليمان عن رجل عن ابى عبد الله (ع) قال: قلت له اصلى في قلنسوة السوداء؟ قال: لا تصل فيها فانها لباس أهل النار

My father said, 'Muhammad Bin Yahya Al Ataar narrated to us, from Muhammad Bin Ahmad, from Sahl Bin Ziyad, from Muhammad Bin Suleyman, from a man

(The narrator says), 'I said to Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him), 'Can I Pray in the black qalansuwas (a form of hat)?' He said: 'Do not Pray in it, for it is an apparel of the inhabitants of the Fire'.[558]

The hadith is Mawdu (fabrication) due to Muhammad ibn Sulayman who is Da'eef Jiddan (very weak), and "a man" who is Majhul (unknown). Similar hadith with different chain of transmitter[559] is also documented by Sheikh al-

---

[557] Muḥammad Taqī b. Maqṣūd ʿAlī al-Iṣfāhanī, *Rawda al-Muttaqeen*, vol. 2, pg. 135

[558] Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi, *'Ilal al-Shara'i*, vol. 2, chapter 56, hadith No. 3.

[559] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, Furu' al-Kafi (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 6, pg. 281, hadith no. 2

Kulayni and the chain is also Da'eef (weak)[560] as graded by Allamah al-Majlisi. However, he gives us a hint of these "inhabitant of hell." He writes:

ضعيف على المشهور. قوله عليه السلام فإنه لباس أهل النار أي بني العباس لعنهم الله

(The hadith is) well-known to be Da'eef. His (peace be upon him) saying [for it is an apparel of the inhabitants of the Fire], that is "Bani al-Abbas," curse of Allah be upon them.[561]

So, these "inhabitant of hell" and "the Pharaohs" been refered to were the "Bani Abbas." And indeed, the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny) predicted how they will rule unjustly, oppressively and corrupt the religion alongside their predecessor, the Bani Ummayyad.

Professor Liyakat Takim saves us time as he writes:

Black as the Emblem of the 'Abbasids

When they began the revolt against the Umayyads, the 'Abbasids raised black banners and used the color black as a symbol of political resistance.

They retained black as their royal color; later the caliph a-Mansur (d. 775) commanded the courtiers to wear black. The black turban was the headwear which was donned by men. As Teresa Bernheimer has noted, the 'Alids (Alawis) not only supported the 'Abbasids, but started wearing black in order to show their allegiance and loyalty to the new rulers.

The first 'Alid from the Hassanid branch, who wore the 'Abbasid color was al-Hassan b. Zayd b. al-Hassan b. Ali (d. 784). High, black hats called qalansuwas were worn by the 'Abbasid caliphs from the time of al-Mansur to al-

---

[560] Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 22, pg. 327

[561] Ibid, vol. 15, pg. 321

Musta'in (d. 866). 'Alids who wanted to serve in the administration had to comply with this color. In addition, prominent 'Alids were often pressured to wear the black clothes of the 'Abbasids. Those descendants of the Prophet who were not prominent or serving the court were allowed to wear green turbans, even though the Prophet himself is not recorded to have worn a turban of that color.

The Shi'i Imams wore black only when they were forced to. This can be discerned from the following tradition: Dawud al-Riqqi narrates: "The Shi'a questioned Ja'far al-Sadiq regarding the wearing of black clothes. Once, I saw the Imam sitting while clothed in a black robe, a black hat, and a pair of black socks with black cotton lining. He said: 'Render your heart white and you may wear whatever you please.' Al-Saduq, a prominent Shia narrator of hadith explains: 'The Imam performed this action out of compulsion and taqiyya (dissimulation). He said this as a result of accusations that had been made against him by the enemy, for the Imam does not consider the wearing of black clothes to be permissible.'" The tradition indicates that the Imams and their followers would not wear black clothes or turbans unless they were compelled to do so...

Generally speaking, for the Shi'is, unless one is mourning or wearing boots, a robe, or a turban, wearing black is seen as detestable. Al-Sadiq is even reported to have stated that black is the color of hell and that one should not pray in it. According to several traditions, al-Sadiq encouraged his followers to wear white. He reportedly said, "Wear white garments since [white] is the best and cleanest of all the colors, and bury your deceased corpses in a white kafn shroud. ... al-Sadiq said: "Imam Ali used to wear white most of the time."[562]

---

[562] Liyakat Takim, *Black or White: The Turbanization of Shi'i Islam* [McMaster University, 2018], pg. 12 – 16.

AT-TAQIYYAH
[DISSIMULATION]

CHAPTER FOURTY FIVE

AT-TAQIYYAH

Question 77:

You always claim that dissimulation is your religion and the religion of your Imams. Neglecting it is like neglecting prayers (Biharul Anwar 75/421).

Here in Sokoto, we have witnessed dissimulation because all those who came and took oaths to change from Shi'ah in the mosque of Sultan Bello were later confirmed to be untrue—an automatic dissimulation.

I need an answer to the following provision: In "Nahjus Sa'adati" (2/339), Ali, Radiyallahu Anhu, came with sorrow, saying: "What will you do when the time comes in the near future?" At that time, the laws of Allah will be neglected, the public treasury will be squandered, and hatred will be shown toward whoever loves Allah, while those who hate Allah and His laws will be loved. They asked him, "What then shall we do?" He replied: "You should act like the companions of Isa (Jesus, son of Mary). Their flesh was cut with saws; they were crucified." But they never retracted. He further stated that being killed for obeying Allah is better than living in a sinful situation. Our question is: if this should be true—and it is—then what is the reason and need for dissimulation?

THE REPLY

The way the Shi'ah antagonists used to treat the issue of at-Taqiyyah is disheartened. Like every other issue, it is shabbily treated and usually presented as if it is a Shi'ah invention and some will even go as far as dividing it into two – Sunni Taqiyyah and Shi'ah Taqiyyah with emphasis that the former is Sunnah and the later is lie (al-Kadhb) which Allah has condemned[563] Therefore it is no surprise

---

[563] Interestingly, in the school of Ahlu Sunnah, lying is allowed to please one's wife as we read in this hadith:

that the Professor follows the same line of reasoning as he writes:

You always claim that dissimulation is your religion and the religion of your Imams. Neglecting it is like neglecting prayers (Biharul Anwar 75/421).

Here in Sokoto, we have witnessed dissimulation because all those who came and took oaths to change from Shi'ah in the mosque of Sultan Bello were later confirmed to be untrue—an automatic dissimulation.

With this antagonistic presentation of Taqiyyah, it is necessary to present the concept of Taqiyyah in line with Shi'ah belief. In sha Allah, we shall return to the points (especially the hadith) raised by the Professor soon.

MEANING OF TAQIYYAH

Taqiyyah means avoiding danger and in the Shari'a terminology, it is refusal to express one's view and religion in cases where the person (will) suffers financial or human or incidental loss. In other words, it is rescuing a person from the danger that he is aware of from others by saying or doing something contrary to the basic duty of the Shari'a.

Taqiyyah in the terminology of theologians is covering up and not expressing a religious belief and even abandoning its rites when there is a danger of revealing it.

The Shi'ah consider it permissible and in some cases obligatory. Proponents of Taqiyyah believe that this is not permissible for the person of the Prophet, because he is the founder of religion and the revelator of the rules. However, if the religious leaders were in danger of performing one of their duties, it was permissible for them to perform taqiyyah in order to protect the interests of the individual

---

Asma bint Yazid narrated that the Messenger of Allah said: it is not lawful to lie except in three cases: Something the man tells his wife to please her, to lie during war, and to lie in order to bring peace between the people.

or the congregation. This is a mechanism that agrees perfectly with human fitrah.

TAQIYYAH IN THE QUR'AN

One of the logical and rational teachings of the Qur'an is the permissibility of a believer to conceal his belief in a situation where if expressing it, his life, dignity and property is endangered. There are ample references to this effect in the Qur'an from among the people of old, and the companions of the Prophet, salallahu alayhi wa ahlihi. For example:

لَّا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِن دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَمَن يَفْعَلْ ذَٰلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا أَن تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً وَيُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللَّهُ نَفْسَهُ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ

Let not the believers take for friends or helpers Unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah: except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself; for the final goal is to Allah.[564]

The expression ["tattaqu" and "tuqaat"] used in the verse إِلَّا أَن تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً [except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them] is unanimously agreed upon to be at-Taqiyyah.

CASE ONE: PROPHET IBRAHIM AND PROPHET YUSUF

When the Mushriqeen (polytheists) were trying to "coerce" Prophet Ibrahim to follow them to their idol worshipping and there was no way he could escape the invitation, he said:

فَقَالَ إِنِّي سَقِيمٌ Then he said: Surely I am sick

---

[564] Surah Aali Imran, verse 28

So they went away from him, turning back.[565] فَتَوَلَّوْا عَنْهُ مُدْبِرِينَ

Sheikh al-Kulayni documents:

عِدَّةٌ مِنْ أَصْحَابِنَا عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ خَالِدٍ عَنْ عُثْمَانَ بْنِ عِيسَى عَنْ سَمَاعَةَ عَنْ أَبِي بَصِيرٍ قَالَ

قَالَ أَبُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ(عليه السلام) التَّقِيَّةُ مِنْ دِينِ اللَّهِ قُلْتُ مِنْ دِينِ اللَّهِ قَالَ إِي وَ اللَّهِ مِنْ دِينِ اللَّهِ وَ لَقَدْ قَالَ يُوسُفُ(عليه السلام) أَيَّتُهَا الْعِيرُ إِنَّكُمْ لَسارِقُونَ وَ اللَّهِ مَا كَانُوا سَرَقُوا شَيْئاً وَ لَقَدْ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ(عليه السلام) إِنِّي سَقِيمٌ وَ اللَّهِ مَا كَانَ سَقِيماً

A number of our people have narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Khalid from 'Uthrnan ibn 'Isa from Sama'a from abu Basir who has said the following:

Abu Abd Allah (peace be upon him) has said, 'Al-Taqiyyah is of the religion of Allah.' I asked, "Is it of the religion of Allah?" The Imam said, "Yes, by Allah, it is of the religion of Allah. Yusuf (the prophet) had said, "O people of the caravan of camels, you are thieves."[566] By Allah, they had not stolen anything and Ibrahim had said, "I am ill", by Allah, he had no illness.[567]

Both Prophet Yusuf and Prophet Ibrahim (peace be upon them) had important interests to protect, thereby, they resulted to Taqiyyah. Indeed, at-Taqiyyah is of Allah's religion, not outside it.

---

[565] Surah As-Saaffat, Verse 89 – 90

[566] Surah Yusuf: 70

[567] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 2, pg. 133, Bab at-Taqiyyah, hadith no. 3

CASE TWO: A BELIEVER OF PHARAOH'S HOUSEHOLD

Allah reveals in His glorious book:

وَقَالَ رَجُلٌ مُّؤْمِنٌ مِّنْ آلِ فِرْعَوْنَ يَكْتُمُ إِيمَانَهُ أَتَقْتُلُونَ رَجُلًا أَن يَقُولَ رَبِّيَ اللَّهُ وَقَدْ جَاءَكُم بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ مِن رَّبِّكُمْ وَإِن يَكُ كَاذِبًا فَعَلَيْهِ كَذِبُهُ وَإِن يَكُ صَادِقًا يُصِبْكُم بَعْضُ الَّذِي يَعِدُكُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي مَنْ هُوَ مُسْرِفٌ كَذَّابٌ

And a believing man of Firon's people who hid his faith said: What! Will you slay a man because he says: My Lord is Allah, and indeed he has brought to you clear arguments from your Lord? And if he be a liar, on him will be his lie, and if he be truthful, there will befall you some of that which he threatens you (with); surely Allah does not guide him who is extravagant, a liar. [Sura al-Ghafir: 28]

CASE THREE: AMMAR IBN YASIR

Ammar was one the earliest Sahabah of the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny). He together with his parents were captured by the polytheists who demanded they should renounce their Islamic faith. The parents of Ammar refused

and they were killed. But Ammar after being tortured did. Then, Allah revealed this verse:

مَن كَفَرَ بِٱللَّهِ مِنۢ بَعۡدِ إِيمَٰنِهِۦٓ إِلَّا مَنۡ أُكۡرِهَ وَقَلۡبُهُۥ مُطۡمَئِنُّۢ بِٱلۡإِيمَٰنِ وَلَٰكِن مَّن شَرَحَ بِٱلۡكُفۡرِ صَدۡرٗا فَعَلَيۡهِمۡ غَضَبٞ مِّنَ ٱللَّهِ وَلَهُمۡ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٞ

Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief - except one who was forced while his heart is at peace with the faith -

but whoever opens their breasts to disbelief, on them is wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a terrible torment.[568]

Imam Jarir Tabari documents:

حدثني محمد بن سعد، قال: ثني أبي، قال: ثني عمي، قال: ثني أبي، عن أبيه، عن ابن عباس، قوله (مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالإِيمَانِ) ... إلى آخر الآية ، وذلك أن المشركين أصابوا عمار بن ياسر فعذّبوه، ثم تركوه، فرجع إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فحدّثه بالذي لقي من قريش ، والذي قال: فأنـزل الله تعالى ذكره عذره (مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ) ... إلى قوله (وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ)

Narrated Ibn Abbas: His saying [Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief - except one who was forced while his heart is at peace with the faith] .... till the end of the verse. This is because the polytheists wounded Ammar bin Yasir and tortured him, then he abandoned it (his faith). Later, he went back to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and relates to him what happened with the Quraysh. Then, Allah revealed (the verse) and mentions his excuse [Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief - except one who was forced while his heart is at peace with the faith] ... till His saying [on them is wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a terrible torment].[569]

However, at-Taqiyyah could be Haram in certain circumstance where the dignity and nobility of, for example, the religion has to be protected and preserved. This was the case of our master Bilal ibn Rabah who was publicly toutured for not renouncing his faith.

---

[568] Surah an-Nahl, verse 106. **This is different from *Nifaq* (hypocrisy) which is hiding kufr (disbelief) in heart and displaying Iman (belief).**

[569] Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Jarir at-Tabari, *Tafsir at-Tabari* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah), vol. 7, pg. 651

CASE FOUR: THE SAHABAH

Imam al-Bukhari documents:

عَنْ أَبِي الدَّرْدَاءِ : إِنَّا لَنَكْشِرُ فِي وُجُوهِ أَقْوَامٍ ، وَإِنَّ قُلُوبَنَا لَتَلْعَنُهُمْ

Narrated Abu Dar'da:

Verily, we used to smile our faces with (certain) people while indeed our hearts curse them.

Narrated 'Aisha:

حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ، عَنِ ابْنِ الْمُنْكَدِرِ، حَدَّثَهُ عُرْوَةُ بْنُ الزُّبَيْرِ، أَنَّ عَائِشَةَ، أَخْبَرَتْهُ. أَنَّهُ، اسْتَأْذَنَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم رَجُلٌ فَقَالَ ائْذَنُوا لَهُ فَبِئْسَ ابْنُ الْعَشِيرَةِ أَوْ بِئْسَ أَخُو الْعَشِيرَةِ فَلَمَّا دَخَلَ أَلاَنَ لَهُ الْكَلاَمَ. فَقُلْتُ لَهُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ قُلْتَ مَا قُلْتَ، ثُمَّ أَلَنْتَ لَهُ فِي الْقَوْلِ. فَقَالَ أَىْ عَائِشَةُ، إِنَّ شَرَّ النَّاسِ مَنْزِلَةً عِنْدَ اللَّهِ مَنْ تَرَكَهُ ـ أَوْ وَدَعَهُ ـ النَّاسُ اتِّقَاءَ فُحْشِهِ

A man asked permission to see the Prophet. He said, "Let Him come in; what an evil man of the tribe he is! (Or, what an evil brother of the tribe he is). But when he entered, the Prophet (peace be upon him) spoke to him gently in a polite manner. I said to him, "O Allah's Apostle! You have said what you have said, then you spoke to him in a very gentle and polite manner? The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "The worse people, in the sight of Allah are those whom the people leave (undisturbed) to save themselves from their dirty language."[570]

---

[570] Sahih al-Bukhari 6131; In-book reference: Book 78, Hadith 158; USC-MSA web (English) reference: Vol. 8, Book 73, Hadith 152; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/78/158

Interestingly, the phrase used by the Prophet اتِّقَاءَ فُحْشِهِ [save or protect from his obscenity] clearly express Taqiyyah.[571]

WRONG OBJECTION

Some might object and reason that Taqiyyah can only be used for Kuffar [disbelievers] and not for Muslims. This reasoning is far from the truth. Although the fact that most of the verses revealed to establish taqiyyah were in relation with the polytheists, however, rationality tells us that it can be used for a mean and oppressive Muslim. There are few cases in the book of ahadith to prove this fact.

CASE ONE: ABU HURAIRAH

Imam al-Bukhari again documents:

حَدَّثَنَا إِسْمَاعِيلُ، قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي أَخِي، عَنِ ابْنِ أَبِي ذِئْبٍ، عَنْ سَعِيدٍ الْمَقْبُرِيِّ، عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ، قَالَ حَفِظْتُ مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وِعَاءَيْنِ، فَأَمَّا أَحَدُهُمَا فَبَثَثْتُهُ، وَأَمَّا الآخَرُ فَلَوْ بَثَثْتُهُ قُطِعَ هَذَا الْبُلْعُومُ.

Narrated Abu Huraira:

I have memorized two kinds of knowledge from Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) . I have propagated one of them to you and if I propagated the second, then my pharynx (throat) would be cut (i.e. killed).[572]

This was after the demise of the noble Prophet when the whole Muslim communities still remained Muslim lands. Abu Hurayrah used Taqiyyah – hiding certain kinds of

---

[571] Although Imam al-Bukhari named the chapter "al-Mudarrat maha an-Nas – being gentle and polite with people" but all his reports in the chapter are acts of Taqiyyah.

[572] Sahih al-Bukhari 120; In-book reference : Book 3, Hadith 62; USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 1, Book 3, Hadith 121; https://sunnah.com/bukhari/3/62

knowledge for the Muslim leaders and communities of his time to save his throat.

CASE TWO: HUDHAYFAH AND UTHMAN

Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah documents:

حدثنا عبد الله بن نمير عن الأعمش عن (عبد الملك) بن ميسرة عن النزال بن سبرة قال: دخل ابن مسعود وحذيفة على عثمان فقال عثمان لحذيفة: بلغني أنك قلت كذا وكذا؟ قال: لا والله ما قلته، فلما خرج قال له عبد الله: (سألك) فلم (تقر له) ما سمعتك تقول؟ (قال): إني أشتري ديني بعضه ببعض مخافة أن يذهب كله

Narrated Abdullah ibn Nomair from Al-A'mash from Abdul Malik ibn Maysara from Al-Nazzal ibn Sabra who said: Ibn Masoud and Hudhaifa entered upon Uthman, Uthman said to Hudhayfah: I have been informed that you have said such and such? Hudhayfah said: 'No, by Allah (swt) I haven't said that', when they went out Ibn Masoud said to Hudhaifa: (He asked) Why didn't you (admit to Uthman) what I heard you say? He said: I spare parts of my religion with other parts of it, because of the fear to lose it completely.[573]

Comment:

صحيح

Sahih (authentic)

What exactly did Hudhayfah say about Uthman? Another Sunni hadith collector, Imam Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276) exposed it that:

---

[573] Abu Bakr Abdullah ibn Muhammad Ibn Abi Shaybah, *al-Mussanaf* (Saudi: Dar Kunuz Ishbiyyah, 1st Edition, 1436 H) [annotator: Sa'd ibn Naasir ibn Abdul Azeez], vol. 18, pg. 351, hadith no. 35260

Hudayfah complaint about Uthman's injustices and oppressions, and that he used to misappropriate Muslims' public funds; therefore, he said Uthman was "(خائن ظالم) - Traitor and tyrant, oppressor."12 And of course, Hudhayfah denied saying it using al-taqiyyah to protect his life as exposed in the aforementioned hadith.

Imam Ibn Mansour summarizes with this document:

وعن أبي الدرداء قال: يا أهل دمشق لا يغرنكم ظرف الرجل ودهاؤه وفصاحته، وإن كان مع ذلك قائم الليل صائم النهار إذا رأيتهم فيه ثلاث خصال: العجب، وكثرة المنطق فيما لا يعنيه، وأن يجد على الناس مما يأتي مثله؛ فإن ذلك علامة الجاهل. وإن قيل إنه ظريف، داهٍ، لبيب، فصيح، عاقل. ثم قال: ألا أنبئكم بعلامة العاقل؟ يتواضع لمن فوقه ولا يزري بمن دونه، ويمسك الفضل من منطقه، يخالق الناس بأخلاقهم، ويحتجز الإيمان فيما بينه وبين ربه جل وعز، وهو يمشي في الدنيا بالتقية والكتمان

Abu Darda said: 'Oh people of Damascus do not be fascinated by a man who is cunning and eloquent even if alongside these attributes he spends his night praying and his day fasting. If you find the following three characters in his personality which are arrogance, interfering in other people's affairs and finding faults in others that he is himself guilty of, then beware as these are the characters of ignorance, even if he was described as well mannered, calculating, thoughtful, articulate and rational'. Then Abu Darda said: 'Shall I tell you the signs of a modest and humble man. The three signs of a modest man are his humbleness to those above him, he does not look down on those below him, he possesses good judgment and reason, he treats people as they would wish to be treated, he keeps

his faith between himself and his Creator (swt) and adopts Taqiyyah'.[574]

THE AHL AL-BAYT, THE SHI'AH AND TAQIYYAH

If there is any group in the history of the Muslims and Islam that used at-Taqiyyah the most, it was the Shi'ah; and this was as a result of years of their persecution.

Before the demise of the noble Prophet (peace be upon him and his progeny), he warned his Ummah as regard his Ahl al-Bayt. Allamah al-Albani documents:

Zayd ibn Arqam narrates the Messenger of Allah saying at Ghadir Khumm:

أَمَّا بَعْدُ ، أَلَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ فَإِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ يُوشِكُ أَنْ يَأْتِيَ رَسُولُ رَبِّي فَأُجِيبَ ، وَأَنَا تَارِكٌ فِيكُمْ ثَقَلَيْنِ : أَوَّلُهُمَا كِتَابُ اللَّهِ فِيهِ الْهُدَى وَالنُّورُ من استمسك به وأَخَذُ بِهِ كان على الهدى، و من أخطاه ضل فخذوا بكتاب الله تعالى وَاسْتَمْسِكُوا بِهِ وَأَهْلُ بَيْتِي أُذَكِّرُكُمُ اللَّهَ فِي أَهْلِ بَيْتِي ، أُذَكِّرُكُمُ اللَّهَ فِي أَهْلِ بَيْتِي ، أُذَكِّرُكُمُ اللَّهَ فِي أَهْلِ بَيْتِي (صحيح)

Then, verily, O mankind! I am only a human being. The messenger of my Lord (i.e. the angel of death) will soon reach me and I will answer (the call of death). But, I am leaving behind over you Two Weighty Things (thaqalayn). The first of them is the Book of Allāh. In it there is guidance and light. Whoever adheres to it and holds fast to it, he will be upon guidance; and whosoever belittles it, he will go astray. So hold fast to the Book of Allāh the Most

---

[574] Muhammad ibn Mukarram, Ibn Mansour, *Mukhtasar Tarikh Damashq li Ibn Asakir*, vol. 20, pg. 36; http://islamport.com/w/tkh/Web/346/2678.htm

High and adhere to it and my Ahl al-Bayt. I remind you, with Allāh, of my Ahl al-Bayt! I remind you, with Allāh, of my Ahl al-Bayt![575]

Commenting on it, the 'Allāmah states: Sahih (Authentic) ... [recorded by 'Abd b. Ḥamīd] from Zayd b. Arqam.

However, shortly after the demise of the Prophet, his Ahl al-Bayt were persecuted in a manner never seen before in the history of any Prophet. Hafiz ibn Kathir describes the Banu Ummayyad thus:

وهكذا خلفاء بني أمية ... وكلهم قد كان ناصبياً إلا الإمام عمر التقيا :

معاوية ثم ابنه يزيد وابن ابنه معاوية السديد مروان ثم ابن له عبد الملك

The Khalīfahs from Banū Umayyah were like this ... ALL OF THEM were Nāsibīs, except Imām 'Umar (ibn Abdulazeez) the Pious: Mu'āwiyah then his son Yazīd, then his grandson Mu'āwiyah al-Sadīd; Marwān, then his son 'Abd Al-Malik.[576]

Sheikh Ibn Uthaymin writes:

"The Nawasib (singular: Nasibi) are those who set up enmity against the Ahl al-Bayt, and hated them and cursed them."[577]

Mu'awiyyah, the first Khalifah of the Umayyad dynasty established a Sunnah of cursing Ali and the rest of the Ahl al-Bayt together with their Shi'ah [followers and supporters] on the Minbar. Imam Abi Ya'la documents the reaction of Umm Salamah:

---

[575] Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn b. al-Ḥajj Nūḥ b. Tajātī b. Ādam al-Ashqūdrī al-Albānī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaghīr wa Ziyādātuhu* (Al-Maktab al-Islāmī), vol. 1, pp. 286-287, # 1351

[576] Abū al-Fidā 'Imād al-Dīn b. Kathīr al-Qurshī al-Dimashqī, *al-Bidāyah wa al-NIhāyah* (1st edition, 1419 H) vol. 17, p. 375

[577] Ibn al-Uthaymin, Sharh al-'Aqidah al-Wasitiyah, vol. 2, pg. 283

Narrated Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Jadalī: Umm Salamah said, "Why do you curse the Messenger of Allāh upon the PULPITS?" I said, "How is that possible?" She said, "Don't you curse 'Alī and WHOSOEVER loves him? I testify that the Messenger of Allāh loved him."[578]

The Banu Umayyad ruled the Muslim world for 89 years and no one suffered more than the Ahl al-Bayt and their Shi'ah at their (Bani Umayyad) oppressive hands. They did not only hate and (used to) curse the Ahl al-Bayt together with their Shi'ah but also persecuted and killed them endlessly. We have revealed the gruesome killing of Imam al-Husein and other members of the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt together with their Shi'ah and companions on the plain of Kar'bala. The aftermath of the tragedy of Kar'bala was even worse in the continual persecution of the Ahl al-Bayt and their followers.

Imam Muhammad Abd al-Rauf al-Munawi while commenting on the hadith [I have left over you two khalifah – the book of Allah and my offspring, the Ahl al-Bayt] quoted Imam al-Qur'tubiy thus:

قال القرطبي: وهذه الوصية وهذا التأكيد العظيم يقتضي وجوب احترام أهله وإبرارهم وتوقيرهم ومحبتهم، ووجوب الفرائض التي لا عذر لأحد في التخلف عنها، هذا مع ما علم من خصوصيتهم به (صلى الله عليه وسلم)، وبأنهم جزء منه، كما قال: فاطمة بضعة مني، ومع ذلك فقابل بنو أمية عظيم هذه الحقوق بالمخالفة والعقوق، فسفكوا من أهل البيت دماءهم، وسبوا نساءهم، وأسروا صغارهم، وخربوا ديارهم، وجحدوا شرفهم وفضلهم، واستباحوا سبهم ولعنهم، فخالفوا وصيته وقابلوه بنقيض قصده، فوا خجلتهم إذا وقفوا بين يديه، ويا فضيحتهم يوم يعرضون عليه، فالوصية بالبر بآل البيت على الإطلاق، وأما

---

578 Abū Ya'lā Ahmad b. 'Alī al-Tamīmī al-Mawsūlī, *Musnad* (Damascus: Dār al-Māmūn li al-Turāth; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Husayn Salīm Asad], vol. 12, p. 444, # 7013

الاقتداء فإنما يكون بالعلماء العاملين منهم، إذ هم الذين لا يفارقون القرآن قال الشريف السمهودي: هذا الخبر يفهم وجود من يكون أهلا للتمسك به من عترته في كل زمان إلى قيام الساعة

Al-Qurtubi said: This commandment and the great emphasis it carries necessitate the obligation to respect, honor, and love the Prophet's family, as well as to fulfill the obligations that no one has an excuse to neglect. This is in addition to the well-known unique status they hold with him (peace and blessings be upon him) and the fact that they are part of him, as he said: "Fatimah is a part of me." Despite this, the Umayyads responded to these immense rights with defiance and disobedience. They shed the blood of the Prophet's family, enslaved their women, captured their children, destroyed their homes, denied their honor and virtues, and deemed it permissible to insult and curse them. Thus, they violated his commandment and acted contrary to his intentions. How ashamed they will be when they stand before him, and how disgraced they will be on the Day they are presented to him.

The commandment to show kindness to the family of the Prophet is general and unconditional. However, following their example applies specifically to the learned and righteous among them, as they are the ones who never part from the Qur'an. Al-Sharif Al-Samhudi said: "This report implies the existence of individuals from his family who are worthy of being adhered to in every era until the Day of Resurrection."[579]

In this period, the Ahl al-Bayt together with their Shi'ah resulted to, and promoted the use of at-Taqiyyah. Interestingly, it was not only the Ahl al-Bayt and the Shi'ah that used Taqiyyah in that period. Even the masses adopted it. Imam Dhahabi documents:

---

[579] Muhammad Abd al-Rauf al-Munawi, *Fayd al-Qadir Sharh al-Jami' al-Saghir* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'arifah, 2nd Edition, 1391 H), vol. 3, Pg. 14 – 15

زاد عمرو بن عاصم في حديثه بهذا الاسناد: فلما استخلف الوليد، قدم المدينة، فدخل المسجد، فرأى شيخا قد اجتمع عليه الناس، فقال: من هذا ؟ قالوا: سعيد بن المسيب، فلما جلس أرسل إليه، فأتاه الرسول فقال: أجب أمير المؤمنين، فقال: لعلك أخطأت باسمي، أو لعله أرسلك إلى غيري، فرد الرسول، فأخبره، فغضب وهم به، قال: وفي الناس يومئذ تقية، فأقبلوا عليه، فقالوا: يا أمير المؤمنين، فقيه المدينة، وشيخ قريش، وصديق أبيك، لم يطمع ملك قبلك أن يأتيه.

Amr ibn Asim added in his hadith with this chain of transmission: When al-Walid became the Caliph, he came to Medina, entered the mosque, and saw an old man who had gathered the people, and said: Who is this? They said: Saeed bin Al-Musayyib. (Later) When he (al-Walid) sat, he sent for him (Ibn Musayyib), and the Messenger came to him and said: The Commander of the Faithful asked you to come, and he (Saeed ibn Musayyib) said: Perhaps you mistook my name, or perhaps he sent you to someone else. The Messenger returned and so he told him (al-Walid), so he got angry while they (people) were with him. He said: And on that period people were into Taqiyyah, so they accepted him. They said: Oh, Commander of the Faithful, the jurist of Medina, the sheikh of the Quraysh, and the friend of your father, no king before you wanted to come to him.[580]

After the oppressive Banu Umayyad regime came another oppressive dynasty, the Abbasid who ruled for more than 700 years. Again, the Ahl al-Bayt and their Shi'ah continued to be persecuted and killed even more.

MISCONCEPTION AND EXPLANATION OF FEW SHI'I AHADITH ON AT-TAQIYYAH

---

[580] Shamsudin ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Uthman ad-Dhahabi, *Siyar 'Alam an-Nubala* (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risalah, 1st Edition, 1401) [annotator: Shua'ib al-Arnaut], vol. 4, page 227

Whoever understood the persecution of the Ahl al-Bayt and their Shi'ah [which continues even till date] will easily realize the essence, obligation and importance of using al-Taqiyyah by the Shi'ah. Neither the Ahl al-Bayt nor their Shi'ah can profess their beliefs – the leadership of the Ahl al-Bayt without being vilified and persecuted. In fact, what keeps the Ahl al-Bayt and their Shi'ah alive till date is al-Taqiyyah; otherwise, the master plan of their enemies is to exterminate their existence.

However, Sheikh al-Kulayni has dedicated a sub-chapter to al-Taqiyyah titled "Bab al-Taqiyyah" in the main chapter of al-Iman wa al-Kufr [Belief and Disbelief]. In this section, various ahadith of the Imams of Ahl al-Bayt on al-Taqiyyah were collated. Unfortunately, the Shi'ah antagonists often use some of these ahadith wilfully with the aim of belittling al-Taqiyyah as part of Shi'ah doctrines. Here, we cite few random ahadith as numbered in kitab al-Kafi:

HADITH ONE:

عَلِيُّ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ ابْنِ أَبِي عُمَيْرٍ عَنْ هِشَامِ بْنِ سَالِمٍ وَ غَيْرِهِ عَنْ أَبِي عَبْدِ اللَّهِ(عليه السلام) فِي قَوْلِ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَ جَلَّ أُولئِكَ يُؤْتَوْنَ أَجْرَهُمْ مَرَّتَيْنِ بِما صَبَرُوا قَالَ بِمَا صَبَرُوا عَلَى التَّقِيَّةِ وَ يَدْرَؤُنَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ السَّيِّئَةَ قَالَ الْحَسَنَةُ التَّقِيَّةُ وَ السَّيِّئَةُ الْإِذَاعَةُ

Ali ibn Ibrahim has narrated from his father from ibn abu 'Urnayr from Hisham ibn Salim and others from abu 'Abd Allah (peace be upon him), who has said the following:

About the words of Allah, the Most Majestic, the Most Holy, "These will receive double reward for their forbearance, replacing evil by virtue.... ," (28:54) the Imam said, "Their excercising patience with observing al-Taqiyyah (cautious protective measures) and their repelling evil by means of good deeds means: al-Taqiyyah

is a good deed and publicity or disregarding al-Taqiyyah is evil.[581]

Allamah Majlisi comments: Hasan ka as-Sahih [authentic].[582]

The fact that the word "hasanah [good deed]" has broad meaning, here, one of the meanings given to it is al-Taqiyyah if done as stipulated by the Shari'ah whereby life, property, honor etc are preserved. Neglecting it which could cause loss of life, property and honor is "sayyi'ah [evil]."

HADITH TWO:

ابْنُ أَبِي عُمَيْرٍ عَنْ هِشَامِ بْنِ سَالِمٍ عَنْ أَبِي عُمَرَ الْأَعْجَمِيِّ قَالَ: قَالَ لِي أَبُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ(عليه السلام) يَا أَبَا عُمَرَ إِنَّ تِسْعَةَ أَعْشَارِ الدِّينِ فِي التَّقِيَّةِ وَ لَا دِينَ لِمَنْ لَا تَقِيَّةَ لَهُ وَ التَّقِيَّةُ فِي كُلِّ شَيْءٍ إِلَّا فِي النَّبِيذِ وَ الْمَسْحِ عَلَى الْخُفَّيْنِ

Ibn abu 'Umayr has narrated from Hisham ibn Salim from abu 'Umar al-'A'jami who has said the following:

Once abu 'Abd Allah (peace be upon him) said to me, 'O abu 'Umar, nine tenths of religion is in al¬Taqiyyah (cautious measures). One who does not observe al-Taqiyyah has no religion. Al-Taqiyyah is in all matters except wine and wiping (in Wuzu) over the socks.[583]

Allamah al-Majlisi comments: Majhul (unknown).

---

581 Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 2, pg. 133, Bab at-Taqiyyah, hadith no. 1

582 Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 9, pg. 165

583 Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 2, pg. 133, Bab at-Taqiyyah, hadith no. 2

Interestingly, the statement ['One who does not observe al-Taqiyyah has no religion'] in the hadith is also found in the hadith book of the Ahlu Sunnah.

Allamah Ali al-Muttaqi documents:

al-Daylami – Ali [ibn Abi Talib]:

لَا دِينَ لِمَنْ لَا تَقِيَّةَ لَهُ

One who does not observe al-Taqiyyah has no religion.[584]

Although the hadith in Shi'i record is graded Majhul, yet Allamah Majlisi explains its meaning:

إن تسعة أعشار الدين في التقية » كان المعنى أن ثواب التقية في زمانها تسعة أضعاف سائر الأعمال، وبعبارة أخرى إيمان العاملين بالتقية عشرة أمثال من لم يعمل بها ، وقيل : لقلة الحق وأهله حتى أن الحق عشر والباطل تسعة أعشار ولا بد لأهل الحق من المماشاة مع أهل الباطل فيها حال ظهور دولتهم ليسلموا من بطشهم ، ولا يخفى ما فيه.

ولا دين » أي كاملا« إلا في النبيذ » أقول: سيأتي في كتاب الطهارة » في حديث زرارة: ثلاثة لا أتقي فيهن أحدا: شرب المسكر ، ومسح الخفين ، ومتعة الحج ، وهذا مخالف للمشهور من كون التقية من كل شيء إلا في الدماء. ..

The statement 'Nine-tenths of religion lies in dissimulation (taqiyya)' means that the reward for practicing taqiyya in its appropriate time is nine times greater than that for other deeds. In other words, the faith of those who practice taqiyya is ten times stronger than those who do not. It has also been said that this is due to the scarcity of truth and its followers, such that truth constitutes only one-tenth while

---

584 Ali Muttaqi al-Hindi, *Kanz al-Ummal*, vol. 3, pg. 96, hadith no. 5665

falsehood makes up nine-tenths. Therefore, the people of truth must adopt a form of accommodation with the people of falsehood during the latter's rule to protect themselves from harm. The implications of this are evident.

''There is no religion'' that is completeness ''except with nabidh (fermented drink)'' — I say, as it will be explained in the Book of Purification in the narration of Zurara: 'There are three things regarding which I do not practice dissimulation with anyone: drinking intoxicants, wiping over leather socks, and temporary marriage during pilgrimage.' This contradicts the widely held opinion that dissimulation is applicable in all matters except bloodshed. ...[585]

In a similar hadith context, Allamah al-Albani explains the meaning of "he has no religion..." thus:

نحن عندنا حديث صحيح قال عليه الصلاة والسلام (لا إيمان لمن لا أمانة له ولا دين لمن لا عهد له) شو بنقول هلا (لا دين لمن لا عهد له) بنكفره؟ لا لكان شو معنى الحديث لا دين كاملا وها الي ما عنده أمانة قال (لا إيمان لمن لا أمانة له) أي لا إيمان كاملا لأن الإيمان درجات بضع وسبعون شعبة

We have a true hadith. He (may blessings and peace be upon him) said: [There is no faith for one who has no trust and no religion for one who has no covenant]. No, what is the meaning of the hadith [no religion] completeness, and here is what it has for trust. He said [There is no faith for the one who has no trust], that is, no complete faith, because faith has a number of seventy degrees.[586]

---

585 Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 9, pg. 166

586 Sheikh Nasir Din al-Albani متفرقات للألباني-308

http://alathar.net/home/esound/index.php?op=codevi&coid=16502
5

In conclusion, at-Taqiyyah is allowed to be used in all circumstances when it is needed to be used except in abovementioned three cases. And whosoever abandons it and refused to use it where it is necessary has no complete religion.

HADITH THREE:

The third hadith [Al-Taqiyyah is of the religion of Allah] has been explained at the beginning of this chapter.

HADITH FOUR:

The fourth hadith in kitab al-Kafi [Bab at-Taqiyyah] is also hadith Majhul. Not authentic.

HADITH FIVE:

أَبُو عَلِيٍّ الْأَشْعَرِيُّ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ الْكُوفِيِّ عَنِ الْعَبَّاسِ بْنِ عَامِرٍ عَنْ جَابِرٍ الْمَكْفُوفِ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أَبِي يَعْفُور عَنْ أَبِي عَبْدِ اللَّهِ(عليه السلام) قَالَ اتَّقُوا عَلَيْمْ فَاحْجُبُوهُ بِالتَّقِيَّةِ فَإِنَّهُ لَا إِيمَانَ لِمَنْ لَا تَقِيَّةَ لَهُ إِنَّمَا أَنْتُمْ فِي النَّاسِ كَالنَّحْلِ فِي الطَّيْرِ لَوْ أَنَّ الطَّيْرَ تَعْلَمُ مَا فِي أَجْوَافِ النَّحْلِ مَا بَقِيَ مِنْهَا شَيْءٌ إِلَّا أَكَلَتْهُ وَ لَوْ أَنَّ النَّاسَ عَلِمُوا مَا فِي أَجْوَافِكُمْ أَنَّكُمْ تُحِبُّونَّا أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ لَأَكَلُوكُمْ بِأَلْسِنَتِهِمْ وَ لَنَحَلُوكُمْ فِي السِّرِّ وَ الْعَلَانِيَةِ رَحِمَ اللَّهُ عَبْداً مِنْكُمْ كَانَ عَلَي وَلَايَتِنَا

Abu Ali al-Ash'ari has narrated from al-Hassan ibn Ali al-Kufl from al-'Abbas ibn 'Amir from Jabir al-Makfuf' from 'Abd Allah ibn abu Ya'fur from abu 'Abd Allah (peace be upon him), who has said the following:

Protect your religion and veil it with al-Taqiyyah (protective measures); one who does not observe al-Taqiyyah has no belief. You amongst the people are like honeybees amongst the birds. Had birds known what is

inside honeybees no honeybee would have been left and it all would have been consumed. Had people known that you love Ahl al-Bayt they might have destroyed you with their tongues, abusing you in private and in public. May Allah bless those of you who are in our Walayah (Divine Guardianship).[587]

Allamah al-Majlisi also comments: Majhul [Unknown][588]

The meaning of the majhul hadith can also be understood in line with the explanation of hadith Two. And the "religion [that is, belief]" of the the Shi'ah is the Wilayah [leadership] of the Ahl al-Bayt; and this is what makes them to be persecuted and killed. Therefore, such belief should be veiled to protect their lives from the oppressors and tyrants who had usurped the leadership.

Interestingly, the statement "one who does not observe al-Taqiyyah has no belief" is also found in the book of Ahlu Sunnah, and its chain is authentic.

Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah documents:

حدثنا وكيع عن إسرائيل عن عبد الأعلى عن ابن الحنفية قال: سمعته يقول: لا إيمان لمن لا تقية له

Waki – Is'raeel – Abd al-A'la – Ibn al-Hanafiyyah: I heard him says: He has no faith [one] who does not observe Taqiyyah.[589]

Al-Hanafiyyah is Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib.

HADITH TWELVE:

---

[587] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 2, pg. 133, Bab at-Taqiyyah, hadith no. 5

[588] Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 9, pg. 169

[589] Abu Bakr Abdullah ibn Muhammad Ibn Abi Shaybah, *al-Mussanaf* (Saudi: Dar Kunuz Ishbiyyah, 1st Edition, 1436 H) [annotator: Sa'd ibn Naasir ibn Abdul Azeez], vol. 18, pg. 350, hadith no. 35255

عَنْهُ عَنْ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ مُعَمَّرِ بْنِ خَلَّادٍ قَالَ سَأَلْتُ أَبَا الْحَسَنِ(عليه السلام) عَنِ الْقِيَامِ لِلْوُلَاةِ فَقَالَ قَالَ أَبُو جَعْفَرٍ(عليه السلام) التَّقِيَّةُ مِنْ دِينِي وَ دِينِ آبَائِي وَ لَا إِيمَانَ لِمَنْ لَا تَقِيَّةَ لَهُ

It is narrated from him (narrator of the Hadith above) from Ahmad ibn Muhammad from Mu"ammar ibn Khallad who has said the following:

Once I asked abu aI-Hassan (peace be upon him), about standing up to salute the rulers (to show respect). He said that abu Ja'far (peace be upon him), has said, 'Al-Taqiyyah is of my religion and the religion of my predecessors. Whoever disregards al-Taqiyyah has no faith.[590]

Allamah al-Majlisi comments: Sahih (authentic)[591]

The fact that previous Prophets used at-Taqiyyah and the noble Prophet, his Ahl al-Bayt and various sahabah also used at-Taqiyyah; and Allah in His glorious book talks about at-Taqiyyah in good manner at various verses clearly proved the statement [Al-Taqiyyah is of my religion and the religion of my predecessors]. And the word "...has no faith" means "has no complete faith." Other statement has been explained in the previous hadith.

---

[590] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 2, pg. 135, Bab at-Taqiyyah, hadith no. 12

[591] Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 9, pg. 179

HADITH THIRTEEN:

The last hadith this chapter will treat is hadith No. 13 in the "Bab al-Taqiyyah" of kitab al-Kafi. The hadith shed light on how at-Taqiyyah should be applied. Sheikh al-Kulayni documents:[592]

عَلِيُّ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ حَمَّادٍ عَنْ رِبْعِيٍّ عَنْ زُرَارَةَ

عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ(عليه السلام) قَالَ التَّقِيَّةُ فِي كُلِّ ضَرُورَةٍ وَ صَاحِبُهَا أَعْلَمُ بِهَا حِينَ تَنْزِلُ بِهِ

Ali ibn Ibrahim has narrated from his father from Hammad from Rib'i from Zurara from abu Ja'far (peace be upon him), who has said the following:

Al-Taqiyyah (protective measures) is for when and wherever needed and the one involved in it knows best how to apply it.

Allamah al-Majlisi comments: Hasan-Sahih (authentic)[593]

Here, Sheikh al-Mufid beautifully explains and gives the summary of the usage of al-Taqiyyah. He writes:

34. ON DISSIMULATION (AT-TAQIYYAH)

Abu Ja'far (i.e. Sheikh As-Saduq) says: "Chapter concerning at-Taqiyyah".

(Al-Mufid adds): Dissimulation is disguising the truth and concealing belief therein, reticence in the face of one's opponents and refraining from divulging to them that which might result in injury to one's religious or worldly welfare. It is obligatory only when injury is absolutely certain, or the pre-sumption of it is very strong. But if it was

---

[592] Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, *al-Kafi* (Beirut: Manshurah al-Fajr, 1st Edition, 1428 H), vol. 2, pg. 135, Bab at-Taqiyyah, hadith no. 13

[593] Muhammad Baaqir Al-Majlisi, *Mir'atul-Uqul* (Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1409 H), vol. 9, pg. 180

not certain or obvious that harm would result from disclosing the truth, nor was persumption strong, THEN DISSIMULATION IS NOT OBLIGATORY. The truthful ones, (the Imams), peace be upon them, have ordered a certain group of their followers not only to refrain and cease from demonstrating the truth, but also to veil and conceal it from the enemies of the religion, and to appear to them in such a way as to dispel their doubts during their disputation with them, since this was in their best interest; whereas they commanded another group of their followers to dispute with their opponents and divulge their true doctrine to them, and invite them to embrace the truth, since they knew that no harm would befall them. Hence, dissimulation is obligatory in the cases we have put forward; whereas the obligation is removed in other cases, as we have demonstrated above. Moreover, Abi Ja'far has summarized the subject matter, and has not discussed it in detail as we have done. Also, he convicts himself by what he has said on the subject; since he himself has omitted an obligatory act in this respect, and stands condemned by his own words. This is so because he has disclosed his doctrine and the truth in which he believes in his famous audiences and the discussions conducted there, which were well-publicised, and his compilations which enjoyed a wide circulation; yet he has not realized the contradiction between his words and deeds. Then, had he discussed the matter fittingly as should have been done, and bridled his tongue in his

discussions of these things, he would have been saved from self-contradiction; then the truth would have been made plain to those who seek the truth, and they would not have been confronted with difficulties, nor would doubts have obscured the meaning of the subject. But he did as the traditionists do in following the apparent meaning of the words, and abandoning critical methods. This is a view which vitiates the religion of him who holds it and prevents him from achieving fairmindedness.[594]

---

[594] *The Emendation of Shi'ite Creed – A translation of* ***Tas'hihu al-I'tiqad*** *of Abu 'Abdillah, Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn al-Mufid* known as ash-

CASE STUDY OF THE SOKOTO[595] SHI'AH

The Professor writes:

Here in Sokoto, we have witnessed dissimulation, because all those that came and took oaths for changing from shi'ah in the mosque of Sultan Bello here were later on confirmed as untrue, automatic dissimulation.

As the saying goes "there is no smoke without fire," the Professor simply wants to fool us there was no fire but only smoke. Aside the fact that people change and convert from one madhhab (school of thought) to the other for reasons best known to them and their Lord, Islam declares coercion and forceful conversion as absolute Haram. There are instances where Shi'ah were stigmatized, persecuted and killed with their families threatened and their houses destroyed. Their "sin" is being Shi'ah. Even if their beliefs and sect is falsehood, why should they receive such evil treatment?

There is this ultra-dangerous fatwa of Sheikh Ibn Taymiyyah, the most glorified figure in Salafiyyah world. If a non-Salafi Muslim – such as a Sufi or a Shi'i – decides not to openly practise his faith out of fear, he must be killed even if he repents. The Sheikh in his Majmu' al-Fatawa, declares:

واما قتل من اظهر الاسلام وابطن كفرا منه وهوالمنافق الذي تسميه الفقهاء الزنديق فأكثر الفقهاء على انه يقتل وان تاب كما هو مذهب مالك واحمد فى اظهر الروايتين عنه واحد القولين فى مذهب ابى حنيفة والشافعى ومن كان داعيا منهم الى الضلال لا ينكف شره الا بقتله قتل ايضا وان اظهر التوبة وان لم يحكم بكفره كأئمةالرفض الذين

Sheik al-Mufid (d. 413 H)[Tehran: WOFIS; 1st Edition, 1426 H], vol. 2, pg.87

[595] Sokoto is a state in northern Nigeria.

يضلون الناس كما قتل المسلمون غيلان القدري والجعد بن درهم وامثالهما من الدعاة فهذا الدجال يقتل مطلقا والله اعلم

With regards to the killing of someone who publicly displays Islam and hides his kufr, and this is the hypocrite whom the jurists call the zindiq, the majority of the jurists are of the opinion that he must be killed even if he repents. This was the view of Malik, Aḥmad in the most apparent of the two reports from him, one of the two opinions in the madhhab of Abu Ḥanifah, and al-Shafi'i. Whichever of them is a caller to their misguidance, and his evil cannot be stopped except by killing him, he should be killed too, even if he publicly repents, and even if he is not declared a kafir, like the Rafidi [Shi'ah] Imams who mislead the people, as the Muslims killed Ghilan al-Qadri, al-Ja'd b. Dirham and similar other people among the callers. This liar must be killed unconditionally.[596]

Note, what the Salafiyyah Sheikh meant by "...hide his kufr..." is whatever belief that is contrary to the Salafiyyah ideologies.

Another extremist fatwa of the Salafiyyah on the Shi'ah is that of Sheikh Ibn Jibreen. The Salafi Sheikh, Abd Allāh ibn Jibreen answers a question thus:

(42) سؤال ألقي على العلامة عبد الله بن جبرين حفظه الله يوم الأحد الماضي في درس العدة شرح العمدة بتاريخ 1421/8/23 هـ عن الرافضة

سؤال عن الرافضة

[596] Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmu'* al-*Fatawa*, vol.28, p. 555; http://islamport.com/d/3/tym/1/40/377.html

س:أحسن الله إليكم أنا موظف في إحدى الأجهزة الحكومية ويوجد في القسم الذي أعمل فيه حوالي خمسة أشخاص من الرافضة فكيف يمكنني التعامل معهم بصفتي مشرف عليهم.

. ومن صفاتهم التودد إلى الشخص والمبادرة بالسلام ونحو ذلك

فيا فضيلة الشيخ أنا بحاجة إلى توجيهكم في هذه المسألة كيف أتعامل معهم وخاصة في مناسبة الأعياد وبعد السفر وهل من الواجب علي مناقشتهم ودعوتهم ،مع إن تجربة بعض الأخوان معهم لم تأتي بنتيجة إيجابية أفيدوني وغيري ممن لهم إحتكاك مباشر بأمثال هؤلاء ؟

:الجواب

يكثر الإبتلاء بهم في كثير من الدوائر من مدارس وجامعات ودوائر حكومية ،في هذه الحال نرى إذا كانت الأغلبية لأهل السنة أن يظهروا إهانتهم وإذلالهم وتحقيرهم وكذلك أن يظهروا شعائر أهل السنة فيذكرون دائم فضائل الصحابة ويذكرون الترضي عنهم ومدائحهم وتشتمل مجالسهم على ذكر فضل القرآن وعلى ذكر ـ تكفير من حرفه أو ما أشبه ذلك ـ لعلهم أن ينقمعوا بذلك وأن يذلوا ويهانوا وتضيق بذلك صدورهم ويبتعدوا،أما معاملتهم فيعاملهم الإنسان بالشدة فيظهرفي وجوههم الكراهية ويظهر البغض والتحقيروالمقت لهم ولايبدأهم بالسلام ولايقوم لهم ولايصافحهم،لكن يمكن إذا أبتدؤا بالسلام ـ أن يرد عليهم بقوله وعليكم أو ما أشبه ذلك. أما معاملتهم فيعاملهم الإنسان بالشدة فيظهرفي وجوههم الكراهية ويظهر البغض والتحقيروالمقت لهم ولايبدأهم بالسلام ولايقوم لهم

ولا يصافحهم،لكن يمكن إذا أبتدؤا بالسلام ـ أن يرد عليهم بقوله وعليكم أو ما أشبه ذلك.

Question posed to the scholar Abdullah bin Jibreen (may Allah preserve him) on Sunday during the lesson "Al-'Iddah Sharh Al-'Umda" on the date 23/8/1421 AH, regarding the Rafidah (Shi'a):

Question about the Rafidah:

Q: May Allah reward you. I work in a government department, and there are about five Rafidah individuals in the section where I work. How should I deal with them, given that I am their supervisor?

They are characterized by being friendly, initiating greetings, and similar behaviors.

So, dear Sheikh, I need your guidance on how to handle this matter, especially during holidays and after travels. Is it obligatory for me to debate with them and call them to the truth, even though the experiences of some brothers with them have not yielded positive results? Please advise me and others who interact directly with such individuals.

Answer:

There is often a trial with them in many sectors, such as schools, universities, and government departments. In such cases, if the majority are Sunni, we believe they should demonstrate their disdain, humiliation, and belittlement of them. Likewise, they should manifest Sunni practices by constantly mentioning the virtues of the Companions, invoking Allah's pleasure upon them, and praising them. Their gatherings should include discussions about the superiority of the Qur'an and the disbelief of those who distort it or similar matters. Perhaps this will suppress them, humiliate them, and cause them distress, leading them to withdraw.

As for dealing with them, one should treat them harshly, showing displeasure and hatred toward them and expressing contempt and disdain. One should not initiate greetings with them, stand for them, or shake their hands. However, if they initiate greetings, one can respond with "Wa 'alaykum" (And upon you) or something similar.[597]

The beautiful northern Nigeria dominated by the Sunni Muslims has had series of inter and intra religious crisis over the years which have made the region more dreadful and insecure than ever before. In this region, the ultra-fanatical Salafiyyah groups following the extremist fatawa of their Scholars have always been at the center of most inter- and intra-religious crisis since they perceive the majority Sufi and the minority Shi'ah and non-Muslims as kuffar (disbelievers).

Naturally, the emergence and development of Shi'ism in the Northern Nigeria faced so many fierce oppositions of the dreaded Salafiyyah groups which has led to Sunni-Shi'i crisis. The fact that the Salafiyyah have the numerical advantage has made the Shi'ah to be at the receiving end. Sadly, some of the northern States' governments and

---

[597] Al-Fatawa al-Mu'aasir fii ar-Raafidha, vol. 1, pg. 39
http://islamport.com/w/aqd/Web/4376/39.htm

community leaders because of their religious and political partisanship have also contributed largely to these crises.

AlJazeera International reported the crisis that happened in 2005 which Professor Mansour Ibrahim was trying to seed in his favour. The reputable media house writes a headline thus:

Office burned in Nigeria clashes

Hundreds of Sunni Muslims have burned a local government office in Nigeria's far northwestern city of Sokoto, defying a massive troop deployment sent to quell fighting, witnesses said.

Then the news reads:

Doctrinal differences

The Sokoto dispute is ostensibly about doctrinal differences between Shia and Sunnis and access to the central mosque. But Bafarawa, who belongs to an opposition party, has accused members of Nigeria's ruling People's Democratic Party of instigating the violence for political reasons. The Sunni governor's stance that Shia should have access to the mosque has made him unpopular with some Sunnis. The region's religious authority, the sultan of Sokoto, has appealed to Sunni and Shia leaders to help stop the violence.

A letter has been circulating in Sokoto since Monday in which Shia are threatened with attacks unless they leave town or renounce their faith at the central mosque. Worshippers say at least 200 Shia have done so.[598]

That was the truth of the matter. The Shi'ah communities were threatened and brutally attacked to the extent that some had to flee the state and take refuge in other states. Few others that could not were coerced to renounce their faith contrary to Allah's order:

---

[598] AlJazeera News, 04 June 2005; https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2005/6/4/office-burned-in-nigeria-clashes

لا إكراه في الدين

Let there be no compulsion in religion..."[599]

In situation like this, Islam permitted the believers to adopt al-Taqiyyah and this was exactly what the "200" Quran adopted to save their lives, their families' and properties.

Finally, the Professor requests an answer to his question. He writes:

I need an answer to the following provision; "Nahjus Sa'adati" (2/339) Aliyu Radiyallahu Anhu came with sorrow saying; "how will you do when the time will come in a near future?" At that time, the laws of Allah will be neglected, the public treasury will be squandered, and hatred will be shown to whoever loves Allah, while who hates Allah & his laws will be loved? They asked him; what then shall we do? "You should act like the companions of Isah, (Jesus son of Mary). Their flesh was been cut with saw, they were crucified." But they never retract. He further by saying to be killed for obeying Allah is better than to live in a sinful situation. Our question is, if this should be true, and it is, then what is the reason and need for dissimulation?

First, as expected there is no accuracy in the above quote and citation but we shall treat it as presented.

Second, there is no contradiction between the above sayings (ascribed to Imam Ali [peace be upon him]) and al-Taqiyyah. The point is each one of them has its own time and place, and circumstance. Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib (peace be upon him) for example was in a state of silence and al-Taqiyyah during the rule of the first three Caliphs. As much as it was, Islamic practises were still being preserved to some reasonable extent. And when it was time for the Imam to take up his sword, he was never hesitated to do so. Likewise, Imam al-Hasan (peace be upon him) saved the Ummah from being murdered by abdicating his

---

[599] Surah al-Baqarah, verse 256

position to a blood-thirsty and power craving Mu'awiyyah ibn Abi Sufyan. That was al-Taqiyyah.

However, the case of Imam al-Husein ibn Ali was quite different. Islamic practises have been marred and replaced with innovations at a larger extent. While the likes of the Sahabi Abdullah ibn Umar paid oath of allegiance to the evil innovator, Yazid ibn Mu'awiyyah, the cursed who was practicing Kufr openly; and Abdullah ibn Zubayr sought refuge somewhere, Imam al-Husein ibn Ali took a step of reformation of the religion. Rather than him to sell Islam at a cheaper price with oath of allegiance to the evil Caliph, or hide in a corner, he fought till death. In circumstance like that, al-Taqiyyah is haram since the survival of true Islamic practices was at stake.

CONCLUSION

COMMON TERMS

Professor Muhammad Mansour Ibrahim concluded his "lecture-book" of 77 questions with the following:

In conclusion, these seventy-seven 77 questions are few among the questions that the answers would be needed from Shi'ism. I swear by Allah, all I did from these questions has no any intention to dishonor anyone, or disregard someone. It is with a clear mind & intention. Our aim is for Shi'ites to ponder and reason, this will lead us to follow the same path i.e. of the Noble Prophet Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam as Allah says; Q 3:64: "Say (O Muhammad Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam): O people of the scripture (Jews & Christians): Come to a word that is just between us and you, that we worship none-but Allah (Alone), and that we associate no partners with Him, and that none of us shall take others as lords besides Allah. Then if they turn away, say: "bear witness that we are Muslims."

THE REPLY

Even though some of the questions are direct attacks and ploy to mock, if they are in their hundreds, they shall be academically addressed with "wisdom, good manner and excellent presentation" as our Lord instructs:

ٱدْعُ إِلَىٰ سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحِكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُم بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَن ضَلَّ عَن سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ

Call them unto the way of thy Lord with Wisdom and goodly exhortation, and argue with them with that which is best. Verily thy Lord! He is the Best Knower of him who hath strayed from His way, and He is the Best Knower of the guided ones. [Surah an-Nahl: 125]

The noble verse quoted by the Professor in his conclusion together with the one above expresses the usual intellectual and tolerant nature of Islam as against the fanatic way of

violence and propaganda in addressing religious differences. However, it is dishearten when the Muslims failed to imbibe and adopt the instructions of these noble verses and others of their genre. Globally, apart from the fact that the Sunni-Shi'ah differences have caused the Muslims a great loss, it has also contributed to the weakened state of Islamic world so much so that we are at the mercy of our common enemies who are waxing stronger with the Muslims' differences.

The differences between the Muslims can be solved if we truly believe in the above verses. Interestingly, after our Lord has given the guidelines of approaching differences, He warns:

إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَن ضَلَّ عَن سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ

Verily thy Lord! He is the Best Knower of him who hath strayed from His way, and He is the Best Knower of the guided ones.

If this is the reality, then why should we adopt violence, propaganda and takfiri approach in the way we deal with each other? It is obvious that Professor Muhammad Mansour Ibrahim did not approach his questions to the Shi'ah with the way Allah has instructed us even though his intention might be pure. Our hope is that he will find time to sincerely digest the answers we have provided for each of his questions, and if Allah wills, his attitude and perception about Shi'ism will change for good. It is always necessary not to judge the book by its cover. Perhaps a fraction of Shi'ah might have presented Shi'ism in a non-pleasant way, that does not represent Shi'ism as a sect and the millions of Shi'ah worldwide. If the Ahlu Sunnah world would not want to be judged by the deeds of the fanatics amongst them, then why judging the Shi'ah world with the deeds of a fanatical fraction that exist within them? We believe the theological and jurisprudencial differences between the two schools can be solved if we adopt a sincere academic dialogue where only the intellectuals and pious scholars are saddled with such responsibility.

Ayatullah Sayyid Ali Khameini [may Allah preserve him] writes:

"Let the scholars and intellectuals of Islam sit down and formulate a charter of Islamic unity. Let them prepare a charter so that any misunderstood fanatic who is affiliated with this, or that, or that Islamic sect, cannot freely accuse a large number of Muslims of leaving Islam. The preparation of the charter is one of the things that history demands of Islamic intellectuals and Islamic scholars today. If you don't, the next generation will blame you. You see the enmity of the enemies! You see their efforts to destroy the Islamic identity and create discord among the Islamic Ummah! Sit down, heal. Prefer fundamentals (Usul deen) to branches of faith (furu' deen). In the branches of faith, even people of the same sect may not be united, that is no obstacle. There are huge common denominators. Surround this axis - the common axis; all should be integrated into it. Beware of the enemy's conspiracy. Watch out for the enemy's tactics. They (scholars) can have religious discussions among themselves, but do not draw ordinary people into it. Do not make hearts dirty with each other. Do not increase hostilities whether between Islamic sects or between Islamic nations, or between Islamic groups in a nation." [Imam Ayatullah Ali Khamenei (17/1/1386, equivalent to 2007 Gregorian calendar)

We pray to Allah to forgive our lapses and misdeeds. May He heal our defective hearts and aid the oppressed Muslim world.

Wa Salam alaykum wa rahmatullah wa barakatuh

THE END

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abdullah ibn Muslim al-Qutaybah, Tawil Mukhtalif Al-Hadeeth [Beirut: Maktaba al-Islami (annotator: Muhammad Muhydeen al-Asfar]
2. Abi Abdillah Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Abi Bakr al-Qur'tubi, al-Jami al-Ahkam al-Qur'an [annotator: Dr. Abdullah b. Abd al-Muhsin al-Tur'ki] (Mu'asassat ar-Risalah
3. Abi al-Faraj Sibt ibn al-Jawzi, Tadhkirat al-Khawaas (Egypt: Maktab al-Iskandariyyah)
4. Abū 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb Faḍāil al-Ṣaḥābah (Jeddah: Dār al-'Ilm li al-Ṭabā'ah wa al-Nashr; 1st edition, 1403 H) [annotator: Waṣiyyullāh b. Muḥammad 'Abbās]
5. Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī, Mustadrak 'alā al-Sahīhayn (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah; 1st edition, 1411 H)
6. Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn b. al-Ḥajj Nūḥ b. Tajātī b. Ādam al-Ashqūdrī al-Albānī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi'al-Ṣaghīr wa Ziyādātuhu (Al-Maktab al-Islāmī)
7. Abu Abd ar-Rahman Ahmad ibn Shu'ayb ibn Ali ibn Sinan al-Nasai, Sunan al-Sughra

8. Abu Abdillah Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Nu'man, Al-Amaali [The Dictations of Sheikh al-Mufid] (London: The world Federation of Khoja Shia Ithna-Asheri; 1st Edition, 1998)
9. Abu Abdullah Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Musnad (Dar Ihya al-Tarasu al-Arabi, 1414 H)
10. Abu Abdullah al-Hakim an-Naysapouri, Kitab Ma'rifah 'Ulum al-Hadith [Beirut:Manshurah Dar al-Afaq al-Hadith, 4th Edition, 1400H]
11. Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Abdullah al-Hakim al-Naysaburi, Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain (Dar al-Marifat; 1418 A.H/1998)
12. Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Ismail ibn Ibrahim al-Jufi al-Bukhari, Sahih al-Bukhari
13. Abu Abdullah Muhammad Ibn Yazid Ibn Majah al-Rab'i al-Qazwini, Sunan Ibn Majah
14. Abū al-Fidā 'Imād al-Dīn b. Kathīr al-Qurshī al-Dimashqī, al-Bidāyah wa al-NIhāyah (1st edition, 1419 H)
15. Abu al-Husayn Asakir ad-Din Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, Sahih Muslim
16. Abu Ali Muhammad ibn Ismail al-Hairi, Muntaha al-maqal fi ahwal al-Rijal [Mu'assasat Ahl al-Bayt li-Ihya alTurath, Beirut]
17. Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Razzāq b. Hamām al-Ṣa'nānī, al-Muṣannaf [annotator: Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī]
18. Abu Bakr Abdullah ibn Muhammad Ibn Abi Shaybah, al-Mussanaf (Saudi: Dar Kunuz Ishbiyyah, 1st Edition, 1436 H) [annotator: Sa'd ibn Naasir ibn Abdul Azeez]
19. Abu Isa Muhammad Ibn Isa as-Sulami at-Tirmidhi, Jami at-Tirmidhi
20. Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Ash'arī al-Qummī, Kitāb al-Nawādir (Qum: Muasassat al-Imām alMahdī; 1st edition, 1408 H)
21. Abu Ja'far al-Tahawi, Sharḥ Mushkil al-Athār (Beirut: Muasassat al-Risālah; 1st edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Shu'ayb al-Arnaūṭ]

22. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Mūsā b. Bābūyah al-Qummī, 'Ilal al-Sharāi' (Najaf: al-Maktabah al-Ḥaydariyyah; 1386 H)
23. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. Yazīd b. Kathīr b. Ghālib al-Āmulī al-Ṭabarī, Jāmi al-Bayān fī Tāwīl al-Qur'ān (Dār al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Ṣidqī Jamīl al-'Aṭṭār]
24. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. Yazīd b. Kathīr b. Ghālib al-Āmulī al-Ṭabarī, Jāmi al-Bayān fī Tāwīl al-Qur'ān (Dār al-Fikr; 1415 H) [annotator: Ṣidqī Jamīl al-'Aṭṭār]
25. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, al-Furū' min al-Kāfī (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub alIslāmiyyah) [annotator: 'Alī Akbar al-Ghiffārī]
26. Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub alIslāmiyyah; 3rd edition) [annotator: 'Alī Akbar al-Ghiffārī]
27. Abu Ja'far Jarir al-tabari, Tarikh ar-Rasul wa'l-Muluk (Edition, M. J. De Goeje et al; London 1879-1901)
28. Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi, al-Amali
29. Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi, Kitab Man la yahduruhul Faqih (Beirut: Manshuraah Muasassatul-'Alam lil-Matbu'aah, 1st Edition, 1406 H)
30. Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Jarir at-Tabari, Tafsir at-Tabari (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah)
31. Abu Mansur Abd ar-Rahman ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hasan Ibn Hibbatillah ibn Asakir, Kitab al-Ar'bain fi manaqib Umma'ati-l-Mu'mineen [Dar al-Fikr]
32. Abu Muhammad Abd Allah b. Abd al-Rahman al-Darimi, Sunan (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi; 1st edition, 1407 H) [annotator: Husayn Salim Asad]
33. Abū Ya'lā Ahmad b. 'Alī al-Tamīmī al-Mawsūlī, Musnad (Damascus: Dār al-Māmūn li al-Turāth; 1st edition, 1404 H) [annotator: Husayn Salīm Asad]

34. Abu Ya'la Muhammad ibn al-Husayn ibn al-Farra, Musnad Aboo Ya'la
35. Abu'l Qawsim Sulayman Ibn Ahmad at-Tabarani, Mu'jam al-Kabir (Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyyah)[annotator: Abdul-Majeed al-Salafi]
36. Ahmad ibn Ali Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, Taqreeb Al-Tahdheeb (Dar al-'Asima li-Nashr wa Tawzih) [Ahmad Shaghif alPakistani]
37. Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Fadha'il Sahabah (Umm al-Qura University, Makkah Mukaramah, Ibn Jawzi publication, 3rd edition, 1426 H) [annotator: Wasiyullah ibn Muhammad Abbas]
38. Al-Hafiz ibn Kathir, Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem, [Beirut Edition, Dar al-Marifat, 1412H)
39. Al-Hafiz Shamsideen Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Uthman Ad-Dhahabi, al-Mughni fi ad-Dua'afaa' [Ihya at-Turath alIslami, Qatar]
40. Ali al-Muttaqi ibn Hisam al-Hindi, Kanz al-Ummal fi Sunan al-Aqwal wa al-Af'al [Beirut: Maktabah al-Turath al-Islami, 1397 H, First edition]
41. Ali ibn Abi Bakr al-Haythami, Majmau al-Zawaid (Saudi: Dar al-Manhaj, 1st Edition, 1436 H) [annotators: Husein Salim Asad ad-Darani]
42. Ali Muttaqi al-Hindi, Kanz al-Ummal
43. al-Maṭ ālib al-Āliyah bi Zawāid al-Masānīd al-Thamāniyyah (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah; 1414 H) [annotator: Prof. Shaykh Ḥabīb al-Raḥman al-A'ẓamī]
44. Ash'at al-Lam'aat Sharh Mishkat (Farid Book Stall, Urdu Bazar, Lahore; Urdu translation by Allamah Muhammad Abdul Hakeem Sharaf Qadri)
45. Ash'at al-Lam'aat Sharh Mishkat (Farid Book Stall, Urdu Bazar, Lahore; Urdu translation by Allamah Muhammad Abdul Hakeem Sharaf Qadri)
46. Badr al-Din Abi Muhammad Mahmud ibn Ahmad al-Ayni, Umdat al-Qaariy Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar alkutub al'Ilmiyyah, 1st Edition, 1421 H)

47. Fath al-Bari sharh sahih al-bukhari (Dar al-rayan lil tarath; 1407 H)
48. Fayd kashani, as-Saafi fi Tafsir al-Qur'an
49. Ibn al-'Athīr, Usd al-Ghabah fī Ma'rifah al-Sahābah (Beirut: Dār IHyā al-Turāth al-'Arabī; 1st edition, 1417 H) [annotator: 'Ādil Ahmad al-Rufā'ī]
50. Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, al-Sawa'iq al-Mursalah 'ala al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mu'atillah (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Dar al-'Asimah; 3rd edition, 1418 H) [annotator: Dr. Ali b. Muhammad al-Dakhil Allah]
51. Ibn al-Uthaymin, Sharh al-'Aqidah al-Wasitiyah
52. Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī, al-Durar al-Kāminah (Beirut: Dār al-Jayl; 1414)
53. Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, al-Isabah fi tamyiz as-Sahabah (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Alamiyyah, 1st Edition, 1415) [annotator: Adil Ahmad Abd al-Mawjud and Ali Muhammad Muawadh]
54. Ibn Hazm, al-Muḥallā (Dār al-Fikr li al-Ṭabā"ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī)
55. Ibn Taymiyyah al-Harani, Minhaj al-Sunnah [Muasassat Qurtubah, 1st Edition](annotator: Muhammad Rashid Salim)
56. Ibn Umar Yusuf Ibn Abdillah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Barr, al-Isti'ab fi Marifat Sahabah,(Beirut: Dar al-Jil, 1st Edition, 1412) [annotator: Ali Muhammad Al-Bajawi]
57. Imam Abi Ya'la Mawsili, Musnad (Maktab Rushd: Dar al-Mamun li Turath, 1st edition, 1430 H) [annotator: Hussein Salim Asad]
58. Ismail ibn Umar ibn Kathir, Tafsir al-Quran al-Azeem (Dar Taybat; Published year: 1422 A.H)
59. Jamaludin Abi al-Faraj Abd al-Rahman b. Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Jawzi, Kitab al-Dua'afaa wa al-Matruk [Dar alKitab al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut]
60. Kitab al-Sunnah (Dar al-Maktab al-Islami; 1st edition, 1400H) [annotator: Nasir al-Din al-Albani]

61. Liyakat Takim, Black or White: The Turbanization of Shi'i Islam [McMaster University, 2018]
62. Malik Ibn Anas Ibn Malik Ibn Abi Amir Ibn Amr, al-Muwatta
63. Mira Mahdi Puya Yazdi, The Holy Quran [Tahrike Tarsile Quran, New York; 5th Edition; 2005]
64. Mira Mahdi Puya Yazdi, The Holy Quran [Tahrike Tarsile Quran, New York; 5th Edition; 2005]
65. Mirzā Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, Khātimah Mustadrak al-Wasāil (Qum: Muasassat Āl al-Bayt 'Alaihim al-Salām li Iḥyā al-Turāth; 1st edition, 1415 H)
66. Muhammad Abd al-Rauf al-Munawi, Fayd al-Qadir Sharh al-Jami' al-Saghir (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'arifah, 2nd Edition, 1391 H)
67. Muhammad al-Jawzi al-Qurshi al-Baghdadi, Zad al-Masir fi Ilm al-Tafsir (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1407H)
68. Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, Buḥūth fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl (Markaz al-Muṣṭafā al-'Ālamī li Tarjamah wa al-Nashr)
69. Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī, Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār (Beirut: Muasassat al-'Ārif li alMaṭbū'āt; 2nd edition, 1426 H)
70. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmi'ah li Durar Akhbār al-Aimah al-Aṭhār (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā alTurāth al-'Arabī; 3rd edition, 1403 H)
71. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, Mir-āt al-'Uqūl fī Sharḥ Akhbār Āl al-Rasūl (Tehran: Dār alKutub al-Islāmīyyah) [annotator: Sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥusaynī al-Amīnī]
72. Muhammad Hussayn al-Tabatabai, al-Mizan fi Tafsir al-Quran (Qum: Manshurat Jamaat al-Mudarisin fi al-Hawzah al-Ilmiyyah)
73. Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Ansari al-Qur'tubi, Tafsir al-Qur'tubi (Dar al-Fikr)

74. Muhammad Ibn Ali ibn Bawayh al-Qummi (Sheik Saduq), Ma'ani al-Akhbar [researched by: 'Ali Akbar al-Ghaffari, Qum: Mu'assasah al-Nashr al-Islami, 1361, 1st Edition
75. Muhammad ibn Mukarram, Ibn Mansour, Mukhtasar Tarikh Damashq li Ibn Asakir
76. Muhammad ibn Sa'd (Katib al-Waqidi), Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra [Beirut: Dar Sadir]
77. Muhammad ibn Sa'd, kitab Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra (Cairo: al-Nashr Maktaba al-Khanji, 1st Edition, 1421 H)[annotator: Dr. Ali Muhammad Umar]
78. Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Kulayni, al-Kafi [Beirut: Dar Sa'b wa Dar al-Ta'aruf, 1401 H, 1st edition]
79. Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani, al-Fatawa al-Muhimmah (Dar al-Ghadi al-Jadid)
80. Muhammad Salih Al-Munajjid, The Prophet's Methods for correcting People's Mistakes
81. Muḥammad Taqī b. Maqṣūd ʿAlī al-Iṣfāhanī, Rawda al-Muttaqeen
82. Nasir Makarim al-Shirazi, al-Amthal fi Tafsir Kitab Allah al-Munzal
83. Nimat Allah Musawi al-Jazahiri, Al-Anwar al-Nu'maniyyah (Beirut: Muasasah al-A'laami al-Matbua'ah, 1431 H)
84. Ruhullah al-Musawi al-Khomeini, Tahrir al-Wasila (Tehran: Institute for compilation & Publication of Imam Khomeini's works, 1386 H)
85. Sa'eed Ibn Mansour, Sunan (Dar al-Sami'i Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 1st Ed. 1414 H)[annotator: Dr. Sa'd b. Abd Allah b. Abd al-Aziz Aal Humayyid]
86. Sayyid Sābiq, Fiqh al-Sunnah (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī; 3rd edition, 1397 H)
87. Shaab al-Din as-Sayiid Mahmud al-Alusi, Ruhu al-Maani (Ihyaaha al-Turat al-Arabi)
88. Shaab al-Din as-Sayiid Mahmud al-Alusi, Ruhu al-Maani fi Tafsir al-Quran (Ihyaa al-Turat al-Arabi)
89. Shams al-Din Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyah, Ighathatul lahfan fi masayed ash-Shaytan (Beirut: Dar al-'Ilm

al-Fawaa'id) [annotator: Muhammad Azeez Shams and Mustafa Ibn Sa'eed]
90. Shamsudin ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Uthman ad-Dhahabi, Siyar 'Alam an-Nubala (Beirut: Muasassat alRisalah, 1st Edition, 1401) [annotator: Shua'ib al-Arnaut]
91. The Holy Qur'an : Text, Translation and Commentary : 3rd Edition : (Ayatullah Agha H. M. M. Pooya Yazdi and S. V. Mir Ahmed Ali) [Publisher: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an (2002)]

MAJOR WEBSITE

www.sunnah.com/bukhari

www.sunnah.com/ibnmajah

www.sunnah.com/malik

www.sunnah.com/muslim

www.sunnah.com/nasai

www.sunnah.com/tirmidhi

www.sunnah.com/malik